

and gelatine to equal depreciated foreign currencies; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

10372. Also, petition of the United States Fisheries Association, William Fellowes Morgan, jr., president, New York City, urging emergency legislation to meet destructive competition from imports priced in depreciated foreign currencies; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

10373. By Mr. Mansfield: Petition of the Woman's Missionary Society of Gonzales County, Tex., opposing the repeal or modification of the eighteenth amendment; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

10374. By Mr. PARKER of Georgia: Memorial of W. W. Gaines, chairman of the Social Service Commission of Georgia Baptist Convention, Atlanta, Ga., urging that no changes be made in our prohibition laws; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

10375. Also, resolution of the General Assembly of the State of Georgia, opposing the reduction of the tariff on imported fruits and vegetables; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

10376. Also, resolution of the General Assembly of the State of Georgia, having for its purpose the securing of information as to the proper valuation of public utilities in Georgia; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

10377. By Mr. RAINEY: Petition of W. G. Hilbert, of Gloversville, N. Y., and 42 other citizens of the State of New York, favoring the Sparks-Capper stop-alien-representation amendment; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

10378. By Mr. RICH: Petition of citizens of the sixteenth Pennsylvania district, protesting against any change in the eighteenth amendment to the Constitution; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

10379. By Mr. RUDD: Petition of the Peter Cooper Corporation, New York City, favoring additional tariff on glue and gelatine to equal depreciated currencies; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

10380. By Mr. SEGER: Petition of American Federation of Silk Workers, favoring the La Follette-Costigan relief bill and the Black-Connery labor bill; to the Committee on Labor.

10381. Also, resolutions from the executive committee, State department, American Legion of New Jersey, favoring adequate national defense; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

10382. Also, petition of Mrs. George Sayre and other members of the Women's Union of the Community Congregational Church of Little Falls, N. J., favoring passage of Senate Resolution 170 and Senate bill 3770, dealing with the motion-picture industry; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

10383. By Mr. STALKER: Petition of Elwyn D. Swarts and 50 other residents of Hornell, N. Y., R. F. D. 4, urging support of the stop-alien-representation amendment to the United States Constitution, to cut out aliens, and count only American citizens, when making future apportionments for congressional districts; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

10384. Also, petition of Rev. A. S. Cox and 72 members of the Methodist Episcopal Church at Caton, N. Y., urging support of the stop-alien-representation amendment to the United States Constitution, to cut out aliens, and count only American citizens, when making future apportionments for congressional districts; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

10385. By Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado: Petition of citizens of Hotchkiss, Colo., urging the passage of the Capper-Sparks bill to prohibit alien representation in apportioning congressional districts in the various States of the Union; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

10386. By Mr. THOMASON: Petition of the Texas and Southwestern Cattle Raisers Association, requesting that cattle, sheep, and goats be not included in allotment bill; to the Committee on Agriculture.

10387. Also, petition of the El Paso Chamber of Commerce, commending work of Hon. L. M. Lawson, international boundary commissioner in the Rio Grande rectification program; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

10388. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the Good Government Congress of Jackson County, Oreg., requesting that action be taken to reestablish law and order in Jackson County, State of Oregon; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SENATE

MONDAY, FEBRUARY 13, 1933

(Legislative day of Friday, February 10, 1933)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senate will receive a message from the House of Representatives.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives by Mr. Haltigan, one of its clerks, returned to the Senate, in compliance with its request, the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 533) providing for the suspension of annual assessment work on mining claims held by location in the United States and Alaska, with accompanying papers.

The message announced that the House had passed a bill (H. R. 5261) for the relief of Sard S. Reed, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message also announced that the House had disagreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 7716) to amend the radio act of 1927, approved February 23, 1927, as amended (U. S. C., Supp. V, title 47, ch. 4), and for other purposes, requested a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee, Mr. BLAND, and Mr. LEHLBACH were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The message further announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills, and they were thereupon signed by the Vice President:

H. R. 311. An act to approve Act No. 268 of the session laws of 1931 of the Territory of Hawaii, entitled "An act to authorize and provide for the manufacture, maintenance, distribution, and supply of electric current for light and power within the island of Molokai";

H. R. 3033. An act for the relief of Ida E. Godfrey and others;

H. R. 5329. An act to amend section 24 of the act approved February 28, 1925, entitled "An act to provide for the creation, organization, administration, and maintenance of a Naval Reserve and a Marine Corps Reserve," as amended by the act of March 2, 1929;

H. R. 6733. An act for estimates necessary for the proper maintenance of the flood-control works at Lowell Creek, Seward, Alaska;

H. R. 7503. An act to repeal the Executive order of November 23, 1909, making the enticing of laborers from the Isthmian Canal Commission or the Panama Railroad a misdemeanor;

H. R. 7506. An act to repeal an ordinance enacted by the Isthmian Canal Commission August 5, 1911, and approved by the Secretary of War August 22, 1911, establishing market regulations for the Canal Zone;

H. R. 7508. An act to provide for the inspection of vessels navigating Canal Zone waters;

H. R. 7514. An act in relation to the Canal Zone postal service;

H. R. 7515. An act to provide for the establishment of a customs service in the Canal Zone, and other matters;

H. R. 7523. An act to amend sections 7, 8, and 9 of the Panama Canal act, as amended;

H. R. 9166. An act for the relief of William E. B. Grant;

H. R. 9385. An act authorizing Roy H. Campbell, Charles H. Brown, G. H. Wilsey, and Dr. H. O. Strosnider, their heirs, legal representatives, and assigns, to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the Des Moines River at or near St. Francisville, Mo.;

H. R. 13974. An act granting the consent of Congress to Bonner County, State of Idaho, to construct, maintain, and operate a free highway bridge across Pend Oreille Lake at the city of Sandpoint in the State of Idaho;

H. R. 14060. An act to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across the Columbia River at or near The Dalles, Oreg.;

H. R. 14129. An act to extend the time for completing the construction of a bridge across that portion of Lake Michigan lying opposite the entrance to Chicago River, Ill.; and a bridge across the Michigan Canal, otherwise known as the Ogden Slip, in the city of Chicago, Ill.; and

H. R. 14200. An act to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across the St. Lawrence River at or near Alexandria Bay, N. Y.

THE JOURNAL

Mr. FESS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for the approval of the Journal for the calendar day of Saturday, February 11, 1933.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. FESS. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Ashurst	Cutting	Kendrick	Shipstead
Austin	Dale	Keyes	Shortridge
Bailey	Davis	King	Smith
Bankhead	Dickinson	La Follette	Smoot
Barbour	Dill	Lewis	Steiwer
Barkley	Fess	Logan	Stephens
Bingham	Fletcher	McKellar	Swanson
Blaine	Frazier	McNary	Thomas, Idaho
Borah	George	Moses	Thomas, Okla.
Bratton	Glass	Neely	Townsend
Brookhart	Glenn	Norris	Trammell
Bulkley	Goldsborough	Nye	Tydings
Bulow	Gore	Oddie	Vandenberg
Byrnes	Grammer	Patterson	Wagner
Capper	Hale	Pittman	Walcott
Caraway	Harrison	Reed	Walsh, Mass.
Clark	Hastings	Reynolds	Walsh, Mont.
Connally	Hatfield	Robinson, Ark.	Watson
Coolidge	Hayden	Robinson, Ind.	White
Copeland	Hull	Russell	
Costigan	Johnson	Schuyler	
Couzens	Kean	Sheppard	

Mr. SHEPPARD. I wish to announce that the junior Senator from Kansas [Mr. MCGILL] is necessarily absent because of illness. I ask that the announcement may stand for the day.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. I announce that my colleague the junior Senator from Montana [Mr. WHEELER] is still detained from the Senate by reason of illness. I ask that this announcement may stand for the day.

Mr. NORRIS. I desire to announce that my colleague the junior Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HOWELL] is detained on official business of the Senate.

Mr. FESS. I wish to announce that the junior Senator from Wyoming [Mr. CAREY] and the junior Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. HEBERT] are detained on official business. I ask that this announcement may stand for the day.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Eighty-five Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

LINCOLN—APOSTLE OF LIBERTY

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, Lincoln's Birthday never passes without stirring anew within the soul of the Nation a feeling of patriotism and a sense of "the nobleness that lovely spirits gather from distress." We can not reflect upon his life and achievements without rekindling enthusiasm for those ideals for which he gave his last full measure of devotion. Every year on this occasion "the mystic chords of memory, stretching from every battlefield and patriot grave, to every living heart and hearthstone all over this broad land" are "touched by the better angels of our nature."

Sixty-eight years have passed since Lincoln was assassinated, yet Lincoln is still with us. His spirit is interwoven into the fabric of our national life. His philosophy is built

into our Government and our institutions. His personality endures in both history and tradition as one of the choicest manifestations of humanity. In the words of Joel Benton, the poet:

Some opulent force of genius, soul, and race,
Some deep life-current from far centuries
Flowed to his mind and lighted his sad eyes,
And gave his name, among great names, high place.

The influence of his personality and his achievements can never be effaced from our national life. In reality, Lincoln marches with us down through the centuries, strengthening our appreciation of liberty, holding us fast to the fundamental concepts of the American Union, and mitigating our troubles by his own unshakable faith and quaint humor. Like our rugged Atlantic coast and the impregnable Rocky Mountains, Lincoln has become a vital part of the American heritage.

With each passing year we find new significance in Lincoln's Birthday, because the elemental problem with which he struggled confronts us, differing only in form. That problem, as Lincoln states it, is "whether a constitutional republic or democracy—a government of the people by the same people—can or can not maintain its territorial integrity against its own domestic foes." Thanks to Lincoln's indomitable strength, the question of "territorial integrity," so far as the United States is concerned, has been solved. But the kindred issue as to whether our Government is capable of maintaining economic stability without abridging the liberties of the people is still upon us.

In his day Lincoln proved that the Government could be strong enough to maintain its own existence without being "too strong for the liberties of its own people." If the Great Emancipator could speak to us to-day, he might ask whether the Government will now be strong enough to cope with economic catastrophe without surrendering to dictatorship or socialism. Certainly his interest would go to the heart of every attempt that is made to sacrifice personal freedom and private enterprise to theoretical expedients that may seem advantageous for the moment.

Can human liberty be preserved in the machine age? From underneath the maze of problems that now beset us this question will arise to a position of supreme importance. And we shall turn to Lincoln for inspiration, courage, and advice. If we wish to reach down into the depths of human feeling, down to the fundamental law and to the basic concept of human liberty, as it was established upon this continent by our fathers, there is no richer nor more profound source to which we may go than the speeches and writing of Abraham Lincoln. He lived and breathed in the spirit of liberty. In life and in death his influence has upheld government by the majority, with safeguards for the rights of minorities, as the only practicable formula by which an intelligent and energetic people may avoid tyranny, on one hand, and chaos on the other.

Lincoln understood whence our difficulties of the present day would arise. "At what point," he asked, "is the approach of danger to be expected? I answer, if it ever reaches us, it must spring up amongst us. It can not come from abroad. If destruction be our lot, we must ourselves be its author and finisher. As a nation of free men we must live through all time or die by suicide."

No foreign enemy is threatening us to-day. But from every section of our great Nation come appeals and proposals that would undermine the principles on which American civilization is based. We are told that personal liberties must be submerged beneath economic regimentation. We are asked to give up the right of managing our own affairs for the sake of raising the prices of commodities we produce. We are urged to surrender personal initiative for equal rewards and doles that undermine our incentive to progress. Panaceas of every kind and description flood the Halls of Congress. Millions of our citizens are ready to mortgage their liberty by having the Government take over private economic functions. The heritage which Lincoln preserved and handed down to us is scorned as a priceless heirloom in the hands of yokels.

Lincoln loved the common people as few other great characters have done. The welfare of the masses was always uppermost in his mind. But he had no thought of opening the United States Treasury to them. He made no effort to force one class or group to support another. The Great Emancipator understood well that the function of the Government is not to support the people, but to guarantee them protection and freedom to work out their own economic destiny.

Few Americans have felt the grip of poverty more poignantly than Abraham Lincoln. In childhood he learned the meaning of destitution, and in young manhood want and financial failure were frequently at his door. But out of adversity Lincoln magnified his love of freedom; and when he reached positions of high authority he used his influence to preserve the right of all Americans to struggle from poverty to economic well-being. Lincoln's fears that the right of every man to improve his own station in life might be impaired found expression in his annual message to Congress in 1861. This is what he said:

No men living are more worthy to be trusted than those who toil up from poverty, none less inclined to take or touch aught which they have not honestly earned. Let them beware of surrendering a political power which they already possess, and which, if surrendered, will surely be used to close the door of advancement against such as they, and to fix new disabilities and burdens upon them till all of liberty shall be lost.

This advice comes to us like a solemn warning from history. It embodies the American ideal. It is the principle to which the present generation of Americans must adhere if we are to preserve the heritage Lincoln bequeathed unto us.

Lincoln's devotion to the ideal of liberty is matched only by his faith in the triumph of right. Beneath his zeal in the cause of human rights ran an overpowering conviction that he was doing God's service. In an address delivered September 28, 1862, Lincoln revealed the source of his inspiration and strength in these words:

In the very responsible position in which I happen to be placed, being a humble instrument in the hands of our Heavenly Father, as I am, and as we all are, to work out His great purpose, I have desired that all my works and acts may be according to His will, and that it might be so I have sought His aid; but if, after endeavoring to do my best in the light which He affords me, I find my efforts failed, I must believe that for some wise purpose unknown to me, He wills it otherwise. If I had had my way this war would never have commenced. If I had been allowed my way the war would have ended before this; but we find it still continues and we must believe He permits for some wise purpose of His own, mysterious and unknown to us; and though with our limited understanding we may not be able comprehend it, yet we can not but believe that He who made the world still governs it.

To use his own words, the motto of Lincoln was, "Firmness in the right, as God gives us to see the right."

It is difficult to find a public address of Lincoln in which he did not acknowledge his faith in the Creator or his confidence that the will of God prevails. At Cooper Union he pleaded with a people torn by dissension:

Let us have faith that right makes might, and in that faith let us—to the end—dare to do our duty as we understand it.

At Springfield, when he said farewell to his friends and neighbors before taking up the perilous duties of the Presidency, he pleaded that the faith of his friends might be added to his own:

I now leave, not knowing when or whether ever I may return, with a task before me greater than that which rested upon Washington. Without the assistance of that Divine Being who attended him, I can not succeed. With that assistance, I can not fail. Trusting in Him who can go with me, and remain with you, and be everywhere for good, let us confidently hope that all will yet be well. To His care commending you, as I hope in your prayers you will commend me, I bid you an affectionate farewell.

In his first inaugural address he was still confident that—

Intelligence, patriotism, Christianity, and a firm reliance on Him who has never yet forsaken this favored land, are still competent to adjust, in the best way, all our present difficulty.

When all his masterful efforts to preserve the peace had failed and war became the only means of saving the Union

the faith of Lincoln was not shaken. He called upon the people:

Let us diligently apply the means, never doubting that a just God, in His own good time, will give us the rightful result.

After four years of struggle, anguish, suffering, and destruction faith still burned in his soul. Lincoln humbled himself before his Maker in the simple conclusion that "the Almighty has His own purposes." In the sublime words of the second inaugural he bowed to the will of God, regardless of what it might be, and gave solemn assurance to his countrymen that "the judgments of the Lord are true and righteous altogether."

Lincoln's faith that right makes might, and that the providential hand of God directs this Nation, is a bulwark of strength to us even to-day. He towers among the great of all ages as a servant of God and a follower of Christ, as well as an apostle of human liberty. Shall we say that Lincoln was an instrument in the hands of the Master in preserving liberty and enthroning peace? We do know that he humbly and fervently sought the aid of God in this great cause and that through his efforts right did prevail.

I can wish for no greater blessing for my country in this hour of unrest than the pervading spirit of the immortal Lincoln. No other American has been endowed with such a deep understanding of human aspirations. Instead of trying to fritter away the heritage he left us, let us revive and reassert the wisdom of Lincoln, as a breath of fresh air to a people stifled by an economic depression.

We can not truly honor Lincoln without holding fast to the ideals which he so nobly advanced. Let the influence and wisdom of the incomparable Lincoln flow free all over this broad land. When guided by his faith and his courage, America must go forward as the land where liberty was born and shall never die.

Mr. SHORTRIDGE. Mr. President, the Republic "conceived in liberty and dedicated to the proposition that all men are created equal," in the throes of dissolution; the Union of Washington and Jackson framed by the wisdom and sanctified by the blood of brothers about to be rent asunder; the "government of the people, by the people, and for the people" in mortal danger of perishing from the earth—in that dark hour of estrangement, doubt, and fear the great captain of our country's salvation came.

He came, and thenceforth all was clear. Simple in speech, plain in manner, straightforward in action, tender as a child, fearless as a hero, humble and lowly, he came to speak and to act. Born of southern parents and reared in the broad prairies of the West, whose very winds sang liberty, he realized the curse of bondage and the blessing of freedom. From the unfelled forest, from the log cabin and the country store, from humble forum and obscure dwelling, from out the ranks of the people the great captain came. He came, and statesmen paused and wondered; he spoke, and a nation hearkened to his counsel.

Devoted to truth and the right, opposed to falsehood and the wrong; scorning the tricks and subterfuges of the self-seeking and abhorring the mean and base; loving his country with a devotion that made him forgetful of all save the preservation of the Union, the incomparable leader rose. In judicial tribunal and hall of state, in capital and village, in stately mansion and log hut, bewildered men listened to his words and saw, as they had never seen before, the darkness, the light, and the path—the wrong, the right, and the remedy.

Who was this man that came unheralded out of the West? Who was this man that rose above great statesmen of his day—who was as earnest as Phillips, as gifted as Baker, more profound than Seward, more wise than Chase, more logical than Douglas, more eloquent than Everett?

Who was this man that combined in one soul the simplicity of a child, the wisdom of a sage, and the foresight of a prophet?

Wheresoever among men there is a love for disinterested patriotism and sublime attachment to duty; wheresoever

liberty is worshiped and loyalty exalted, his name, his life, his deeds are known. To-day his image is in all hearts, his name is on all lips. That humble, loving, forgiving, sublime man was the rail splitter of Illinois—sainted and immortal Abraham Lincoln—Abraham Lincoln, child of poverty, champion of freedom, savior of the Union.

Rejoice and give thanks to God. The dark hour of brotherly estrangement is gone forever. The Constitution of Washington and Jackson remains. The Union, strong and great, endures. The "Government of the people, by the people, and for the people" did not perish. The sons of America march all one way.

And for all these blessings we stand to-day beneath the one and only banner of the loyal heart, to pay the tribute of our veneration and gratitude and love to Abraham Lincoln.

Mr. LEWIS. Mr. President, my eminent colleague [Mr. GLENN], representing with me in this honorable body the great State of Illinois—the area from which this distinguished hero of events described in these two epic addresses hailed—would have, because of the appropriateness of the occasion, presented some thought and fitting expression to this honorable body, appealing, as we feel it would have been, to the occasion. But the two apostrophes that have given inspiration, the one from the eminent Senator from Utah [Mr. SMOOR] as the first, and the other an epic from the equally distinguished Senator from California [Mr. SHORTRIDGE] second, have with such completeness presented a picture of such illuminating grandeur that we feel we could not, by any additional offer, do other than possibly impair the perfection presented. Therefore we defer other than to pay our tribute to these delivered addresses, and withhold any additional contribution individually from ourselves.

Mr. President, we, however, beg to express our appreciation and our thanks for this sacred offering borne to the noble soul who in life did so much to hallow with something of sanctity and elevate by ability the great State of Illinois as he contributed guiding lessons of liberty and justice to the world.

Mr. FESS. Mr. President, the statement of the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LEWIS] is a little embarrassing to me, in that he suggested that further utterances about the great liberator might not be made.

Mr. LEWIS. Only as to ourselves; not as to the distinguished Senator from Ohio, conscious that his contribution will add further illumination to any topic.

Mr. FESS. When the most eloquent Senator of the body makes that suggestion, even though it does not apply to anyone but himself, it is very embarrassing for another Senator to rise to say anything. I did, however, want to make an observation about one phase of this great character that is not generally discussed.

Abraham Lincoln is regarded as not an educated man, in that his schooling amounted to less than two years, all told; and yet this man, without education, has made contributions to our literature that are regarded as the rarest that have yet come from the lips or pen of any American.

The famous letter written to Mrs. Bixby hangs on the walls of the corridor of one of the colleges of the University of Oxford as the finest bit of literature touching the spirit and subject of condolence that is found anywhere.

The famous short address known as the Gettysburg Address is in the British Museum and is regarded by the highest authority in English as the finest short speech ever uttered in the English language.

The second inaugural address in many ways is regarded as even superior to the address at Gettysburg. I do not think it is more chaste in language, but there is an emotion and spiritual tone expressed that is unmatched even in the Gettysburg Address:

Fondly do we hope, fervently do we pray, that this mighty scourge of war may speedily pass away.

A prose poem—one of the most beautiful things ever penned.

This man, without education, regarded as uncultured—the world judges culture—delivered the famous Cooper

Union speech that is regarded by the literary critics as the finest example of the balanced sentence in American literature; and yet it comes from this untutored man of the West.

It is that phase of Lincoln that is not generally discussed but is very obvious when his utterances are studied.

Some 12 years ago I undertook to collate some of the statements of Lincoln that might be regarded as original, as gleaned from his various utterances. When I tried to analyze my own speeches and enumerate how many things I had ever said that were purely original with me, that I did not get from some other source, I was embarrassed, because I could not find many. Most of them come from other sources. I am, however, going to ask consent of the Senate to insert in the RECORD this collation of the statements of Lincoln that are properly original, and they will occupy at least two columns of the RECORD.

He was a most remarkable man, yet up to 1857 he was little known. Following the Dred Scott decision, he came to the front in his exposition of it; and then later, in 1858, when engaged in the debate with Douglas, he at once loomed as a national figure. From March 4, 1861, to the 15th day of April, 1865, covering only four years, he, as the head of the Nation, made a more remarkable contribution to popular government in the world than any other man, living or dead—a very unusual character, to the commemoration of whose memory we can justly devote a little time to-day.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the matter referred to by the Senator from Ohio will be printed in the RECORD.

The matter referred to is as follows:

[From The National Republican, February 12, 1921]

SEEING LINCOLN THROUGH HIS WORDS

(By SIMON D. FESS, Representative in Congress from Ohio)

This is the time of year when the country reverts to the significance of Lincoln's influence. Whatever be his monuments in accomplishment as the preserver of the American Union and the Great Emancipator, he has an enduring fame through his deathless utterances delivered from time to time. These utterances clearly pointed the course of history in a momentous era and merely became an index of the progress of our national growth from a slaveocracy defended as a loose confederation of States to an indissoluble union of indestructible States.

In 1858 when he was 49 years of age and known locally as a local political figure, he outlined the issue upon the most sensitive question which within a dozen years was to divide churches, destroy political parties, and threaten the overturn of the Government in the greatest civil war known to history.

"A house divided against itself can not stand. I believe this Government can not endure permanently, half slave and half free."

When his friends urged him against this "d—d fool utterance," and wanted to know "what in God's name could induce you to promulgate such an opinion," his reply was: "Upon my soul I think it is true." To those who condemned him he replied: "Friends, this thing has been retarded long enough. The time has come when these sentiments should be uttered. And if it is decreed that I must go down because of this speech, then let me go down linked with the truth. Let me die in the advocacy of what is just and right."

The same year he pressed Douglas to answer the following question:

"Can the people of a territory, in any lawful way, against the wish of any citizen of the United States, exclude slavery from its limits prior to the formation of a State constitution?"

When he was warned by his friends that unless he desisted from his demand for an answer, he could never defeat Douglas for the Senate, he replied:

"I shall demand an answer. If ever Douglas answers me, either yes or no, he can never be elected President of the United States. I am after larger game. The battle of 1860 is worth a hundred of this."

In New York, in February, 1860, at Cooper Union, he made his greatest long speech. Here he set out the issue as it had never yet been stated by any other man:

"If it [slavery] is right, we can not justly object to its nationality—its universality; if it is wrong, they can not justly insist upon its extension—its enlargement. All they ask we can readily grant, if we thought slavery right; all we ask they could as readily grant, if they thought it wrong. Their thinking it right and our thinking it wrong is the precise fact upon which depends the whole controversy. Thinking it right, as they do, they are not to blame for desiring its full recognition as being right; but thinking it wrong, as we do, can we yield to them?"

Of this speech Choate said:

"His eye kindled, his voice rang, his face shone and seemed to light up the whole assembly. * * * It was marvelous to see how this untutored man, by mere self-discipline, had found his way to the grandeur and strength of absolute simplicity."

It was here where an auditor at the close of the address declared: "Lincoln is the greatest man that has appeared since St. Paul." To his enemies who charged him with favoring social equality he said:

"I protest against the counterfeit logic which says that since I do not want a negro woman for my slave I must necessarily want her for my wife."

Upon the question whether the Nation could safely deal with slavery, he said:

"It has long been a question whether any government which is not too strong for the liberties of the people can be strong enough to maintain itself."

His faith in the Nation as sufficient to perpetuate its liberties was well expressed at Independence Hall, Philadelphia, February 22, 1861:

"I have never had a feeling politically that did not spring from the sentiments embodied in the Declaration of Independence."

He then raised the question why the States had been held together so long, and declared that it was the "sentiment in the Declaration of Independence which gave liberty, not alone to the people of this country, but hope to all the world for all future time, * * * that in due time the weights would be lifted from the shoulders of all men and all should have an equal chance." He then declared he would rather be assassinated than to surrender that principle.

He was soon to assume supreme authority and he seemed to realize the test which was soon to be made, because he made it known that the laws of the Government must be respected and they would be enforced.

"The Constitution will be preserved and defended until it is enforced and obeyed in every part of every one of the United States. It must be so respected, obeyed, and enforced, and defended, let the grass grow where it may."

His views on secession were no less clear than his purpose was determined: "We won't break up the Union, and you shan't," was his dictum.

Upon taking the oath as President he said on this point:

"I hold that, in contemplation of universal law and of the Constitution, the Union of these States is perpetual. Perpetuity is implied, if not expressed, in the fundamental law of all national governments. It is safe to assert that no government proper ever had a provision in its organic law for its own termination. Continue to execute all the express provisions of our National Constitution, and the Union will endure forever—it being impossible to destroy it except by some action not provided for in the instrument itself."

And again:

"In your hands, my dissatisfied fellow countrymen, and not in mine, is the momentous issue of civil war. The Government will not assail you. You can have no conflict without being yourselves the aggressors. You have no oath registered in heaven to destroy the Government, while I shall have the most solemn one to 'preserve, protect, and defend it.' I am loath to close. We are not enemies, but friends. We must not be enemies. Though passion may have strained, it must not break our bonds of affection."

Henceforth the conduct of the leaders of rebellion compelled the chief stress to be placed upon the preservation of the Union rather than protection against the spread of slavery. To Greeley, who had caustically criticized him as an opportunist because he did not free the slaves, he wrote on August 22, 1862, just one month before his preliminary Emancipation Proclamation was announced:

"My paramount object in this struggle is to save the Union. If I could save the Union without freeing any slaves, I would do it; and if I could save it by freeing all the slaves I would do it, and if I could save it by freeing some and leaving others alone I would do that. I shall do less whenever I shall believe what I am doing hurts the cause, and I shall do more whenever I shall believe doing more helps the cause. I shall adopt new views so fast as they shall appear to be true views."

In the struggle for the life of the Union, emancipation had to be decreed, which was done to become effective January 1, 1863. Referring to the cause he said:

"The dogmas of the quiet past are inadequate for the stormy present. The occasion is piled high with difficulty, and we must rise to the occasion."

Soon after, on the field of Gettysburg, Lincoln delivered what is styled the "finest short speech in the English language"—the famous "Gettysburg Address."

The high-water mark of Lincoln's utterance is found in his second inaugural address. I quote that part of it which is properly styled a prose poem:

"Fondly do we hope—fervently do we pray—that this mighty scourge of war may speedily pass away. Yet, if God wills that it continue until all the wealth piled by the bondman's 250 years of unrequited toil shall be sunk, and until every drop of blood drawn with the lash shall be paid by another drawn by the sword, as was said 3,000 years ago, so still it must be said, 'The judgments of the Lord are true and righteous altogether.'"

"With malice toward none; with charity for all; with firmness in the right, as God gives us to see the right, let us strive on to finish the work we are in; to bind up the Nation's wounds; to care for him who shall have borne the battle, and for his widow, and his orphan—to do all which may achieve and cherish a just and lasting peace among ourselves, and with all nations."

Much has been written about his religious convictions. Nothing can give greater meaning than his own utterances February 11, 1861, upon leaving home for Washington:

"My friends, no one, not in my situation, can appreciate my feeling of sadness at this parting. To this place, and the kindness of these people, I owe everything. Here I have lived a quarter of a century, and have passed from a young to an old man. Here my children have been born, and one is buried. I now leave, not knowing when or whether ever I may return, with a task before me greater than that which rested upon Washington. Without the assistance of that Divine Being who ever attended him, I can not succeed. With that assistance I can not fail. Trusting in Him who can go with me, and remain with you, and be everywhere for good, let us confidently hope that all will yet be well. To His care commending you, as I hope in your prayers you will commend me, I bid you an affectionate farewell."

His statement to Professor Brooks who had asked him whether he gave much thought to his obligations to God is as follows:

"I give more time to my obligations to my Maker than to all other questions combined."

Again he said to a group of well-wishers:

"But for those prayers I should have faltered and perhaps failed long ago. Tell every father and mother you know to keep on praying and I will keep on fighting, for I am sure we are on God's side."

On another occasion he said:

"I have been driven many times to my knees by the overwhelming conviction that I had nowhere else to go. My wisdom and that of all about me seemed insufficient for that day."

Next to his faith in God as a ruling passion came his faith in mankind. This was well expressed in his first inaugural:

"Why should there not be a patient confidence in the ultimate justice of the people? Is there any better or equal hope in the world?"

No better picture of his breadth of sympathy, another very dominant Lincoln characteristic, can be found than in his letter to Mrs. Bixby, of Massachusetts, November 21, 1864:

"DEAR MADAM: I have been shown in the files of the War Department a statement of the adjutant general of Massachusetts that you are the mother of five sons who have died gloriously on the field of battle. I feel how weak and fruitless must be any words of mine which should attempt to beguile you from the grief of a loss so overwhelming. But I can not refrain from tendering to you the consolation that may be found in the thanks of the Republic they died to save. I pray that your Heavenly Father may assuage the anguish of your bereavement and leave you only the cherished memory of the loved and lost, and the solemn pride that must be yours to have laid so costly a sacrifice upon the altar of freedom. Yours very sincerely and respectfully."

His rectitude of character is an inspiration for those who serve the public, and it was well expressed in the following language:

"I am not bound to win, but I am bound to be right; I am not bound to succeed, but I am bound to be true; I must stand with those who stand right, but I must leave them when they stand for what is wrong."

Few characters have left so many basic principles of proper public conduct. I quote a few taken from his addresses and letters:

"No men living are more worthy to be trusted than those who toil up from poverty—none less inclined to take or to touch aught which they have not honestly earned."

"My greatest ambition is to be truly esteemed of my fellow men by rendering myself worthy of their esteem."

"Die when I may, I want it said of me by those who know me best that I always plucked a thistle and planted a flower when I thought a flower would grow."

"It rests me after a hard day's work if I can find some good cause for saving a man's life."

"It has been said that might makes right. It is for us and our times to reverse the maxim and show that right makes might."

"Let not him who is houseless pull down the house of another, but let him work diligently and build one for himself, thus by example assuring that his own shall be safe from violence when built."

When criticized because he had changed his mind, he replied:

"I do not think much of a man who is not wiser to-day than he was yesterday."

Lincoln's aspiration was his country's future. His ruling passion was that of love of country—patriotism—the religion of the state. He once said:

"This country with its institutions belongs to the people who inhabit it."

He pronounced it the rising hope of popular government throughout the world, and gave this hope its classic expression in literature. Whatever place his deeds may give him in history his words must signalize him as the Republic's finest product in leadership in that which is highest and best in American life.

Sixty years ago Lincoln came to the head of the Government when the times were pregnant with dire possibilities. Soon the Nation was put to the supreme test to determine whether popular government was possible. No man ever faced a more important mission. It called for the rare qualities of intellect, sympathy, and will. No leader of history displayed a finer talent of ability in a crisis. His grasp of the situation, his patience with discordant factors, his tolerance in dealing with men of diverse opinions, his boundless pathos as well as depth of good humor,

his unerring judgment, his broad sympathy, his determined will, all tempered by the soundest common sense, expressed in the purest and simplest language, all combined to mark him as a man for the period.

Sixty years later the World War has brought its trials. It has left the world with new and unsolved problems. Readjustment to-day demands great leadership. It also demands a spirit of tolerance, patience, good will, and common sense. The leader to-day should have the Nation's sympathy as Lincoln deserved 60 years ago, but which was grudgingly given if at all.

OH, WHY SHOULD THE SPIRIT OF MORTAL BE PROUD?

By William Knox

The following poem was a particular favorite with Abraham Lincoln. It was first shown to him, when a young man, by a friend and afterwards he cut it from a newspaper and learned it by heart. He said to a friend, "I would give a good deal to know who wrote it but have never been able to ascertain." He found out in 1864 that William Knox wrote it.

Oh, why should the spirit of mortal be proud?
Like a swift-fleeting meteor, a fast-flying cloud,
A flash of the lightning, a break of the wave,
Man passes from life to his rest in the grave.

The leaves of the oak and the willow shall fade,
Be scattered around and together be laid;
And the young and the old, and the low and the high,
Shall molder to dust and together shall lie.

The infant a mother attended and loved,
The mother that infant's affection who proved;
The husband that mother and infant who blessed,
Each, all, are away to their dwellings of rest.

The maid on whose cheek, on whose brow, in whose eye,
Shone beauty and pleasure—her triumphs are by;
And the memory of those who loved her and praised
Are alike from the minds of the living erased.

The hand of the king that the sceptre hath borne,
The brow of the priest that the mitre hath worn,
The eye of the sage and the heart of the brave,
Are hidden and lost in the depths of the grave.

The peasant whose lot was to sow and to reap,
The herdsman who climbed with his goats up the steep,
The beggar who wandered in search of his bread,
Have faded away like the grass that we tread.

The saint who enjoyed the communion of heaven,
The sinner who dared to remain unforgiven,
The wise and the foolish, the guilty and just,
Have quietly mingled their bones in the dust.

So the multitude goes, like the flower and the weed,
That wither away to let others succeed;
So the multitude comes, even those we behold,
To repeat every tale that has often been told.

For we are the same that our fathers have been;
We see the same sights that our fathers have seen;
We drink the same stream and view the same sun,
And run the same course that our fathers have run.

The thoughts we are thinking our fathers would think;
From the death we are shrinking from they too would shrink;
To the life we are clinging to they too would cling;
But it speeds from the earth like a bird on the wing.

They loved, but their story we can not unfold;
They scorned, but the heart of the haughty is cold;
They grieved, but no wail from their slumbers will come;
They joyed, but the voice of their gladness is dumb.

They died; ay! they died; and we things that are now,
Who walk on the turf that lies over their brow,
Who make in their dwellings a transient abode,
Meet the changes they met on their pilgrimage road.

Yea! hope and despondency, pleasure and pain
Are mingled together in sunshine and rain;
And the smile and the tear, the song and the dirge
Still follow each other like surge upon surge.

'Tis the twink of an eye, 'tis the draught of a breath,
From the blossom of health to the paleness of death,
From the gilded salon to the bier and the shroud,
O, why should the spirit of mortal be proud?

LINCOLN AND THE GOOD-ROADS MOVEMENT—OF SPECIAL INTEREST TO THE FARMERS

At first thought, it may seem a far cry from Abraham Lincoln to good roads, but it should not be difficult to demonstrate that no more appropriate tribute could be paid to the memory of that great American and the principles for which he stood than the construction of good roads.

Abraham Lincoln stood for national unity and national development as against sectionalism with its fears, prejudices, and passions. He stood for public good as against selfish interests, for mutual understandings and forbearance as against class and sectional antagonisms and intolerance.

More honor is done the memory of Lincoln by the practice of his ideals than by their preaching. Whatever brings communities closer together, whatever stimulates friendly intercourse and interchange of ideas among people of different States and sections having varied interests, whatever encourages the study and discussion of problems from a public and national viewpoint rather than a selfish and provincial viewpoint, must help bind the Nation together, emphasize interests that are common, subordinate those which are local, promote national development, and breed a spirit of national unity.

The individual community, State, or section which is isolated becomes self-centered, selfish, suspicious, and usually antagonistic to the common good. Lines of traffic and travel which make communication easy and inviting and which provide for interchange of ideas as well as of goods which bring all kinds and conditions of people into daily common touch, break down this isolation, destroy this provincialism, and prevent sectionalism. This is so axiomatic that the development of civilization and the destiny of nations have been determined by lines of travel.

THE LINCOLN HIGHWAY

In view of this there is an intimate relation between the nationalism of Lincoln and the subject of good roads. It is especially apropos that the greatest highway in the United States—the old National Road, the first public highway to have been constructed by Federal aid—should have been rechristened and to-day bears the name, Lincoln Highway. It may be equally fitting that the national good roads convention should be held in Chicago this week which marks the anniversary of Lincoln's birth. The convention is said to be the greatest in point of attendance and interest ever held in the history of the good-roads movement. Plans for highway construction in 1921 and successive years, and the discussion of subjects closely allied with the problem of better roads, have brought together at this convention thousands of farmers, shippers, bankers, motor manufacturers, transportation specialists, engineers, and commercial and civic organizations.

The outlook is said to be favorable for more public-highway construction in 1921 than in any previous year. The two underlying reasons for this are: First, the practical suspension of public-highway construction during the last three years, because of war-time prohibitions against use of materials for road building and their shipment, as well as the scarcity of labor; second, the realization upon the part of both producer (of agricultural and industrial products) and consumer of the wisdom, if not the necessity, of having some fairly good substitute for the railroads in event of a great strike or unusual congestion of traffic. Altogether it is said between a billion and a billion and a quarter dollars are available at once for highway construction in the United States. This sum is represented in Federal, State, and county funds which have been collected and appropriated for good roads.

FUNDS FOR ROADS

The favorite method of supplying road funds is by bond issues. In the 1920 November elections five States approved legislation authorizing a total issue of \$192,000,000 in highway bonds. Minnesota voted \$75,000,000; Missouri, \$60,000,000; West Virginia, \$50,000,000; Colorado, \$5,000,000; and Idaho, \$2,000,000. In addition, Virginia voters approved an act permitting its legislature to fix the amount of a highway-bond issue, the limit being fixed at \$50,000,000. In Kansas the constitution was amended so that the State may engage in road construction, and it will pay one-fourth of the cost of not to exceed 100 miles of roads in each county at not over \$10,000 a mile.

California, which in 1919 authorized \$40,000,000 in bonds for highway construction, was unable to carry out its program because the bonds could not be sold at the 4½ per cent interest which they carried. At the recent election the people approved a proposal to increase the interest from 4½ per cent to not over 6 per cent; and this, it is believed, will make it possible to sell the bonds and to proceed with the extension of the State's highway system contemplated when the bond issue was authorized.

In four States proposed highway-bond issues were defeated. These were Florida, \$20,000,000; Montana, \$15,000,000; Washington, \$30,000,000; and New Mexico, \$2,000,000. In each of these States the defeat of the bond issue is attributed to local conditions or to provisions in the respective measures which failed to meet the approval of the people. In New Mexico the issue was opposed by officials as unnecessary. In Florida and Washington it was the intention to use the motor vehicle registration money to float the bond issues and this was opposed. A proposal under which the State highway engineer of Arizona was to have been supplanted by a commission of five members was defeated.

AFTER THREE YEARS

The large amount of money to be spent during 1921 for highway work is in part the accumulations from previous years. During 1918, 1919, and 1920, first war conditions and then shortage of materials, lack of sufficient rail transportation, and the high cost of labor and materials were deterrent factors. Furthermore the condition of the bond market made it impossible to float many of the issues at the interest rates that had been fixed. Therefore comparatively little money was expended in those years and it has accumulated for use in 1921.

During the past three years State bonds for highway improvement aggregating \$533,800,000 have been authorized. In 1918 the issues voted were \$60,000,000 in Illinois and \$50,000,000 in Pennsylvania. In 1919 the following issues were voted: California, \$40,000,000; Oregon, \$12,500,000; Nevada, \$1,000,000; South Dakota,

\$4,500,000; Wyoming, \$2,800,000; Maine, \$10,000,000; Michigan, \$50,000,000; and Utah, \$4,000,000; a total for the year of \$124,800,000.

In 1920 the grand total of road bonds authorized was \$309,000,000. In addition to the issues mentioned above as authorized in the November elections, other bonds authorized include: Alabama, \$25,000,000; Oregon, \$10,000,000; and Maryland, \$3,000,000.

Another sum, totaling \$362,000,000, mostly in bond issues, was provided in 1920 by counties in States where the county is the principal unit in road building and maintenance.

There is still available approximately \$160,000,000 of Federal-aid road funds, according to officials of the Bureau of Public Roads, Department of Agriculture, and this money will be allocated to different States as road-construction projects offered by them meet with the approval of the Federal officers. This money probably will be used during a series of years and will not all become available in 1921.

Beside this money there are large amounts to be used by States, counties, park districts, and municipalities, which will be raised by direct taxation rather than by bond issues, so that the estimate of between a billion and a billion and a quarter of dollars of road money authorized is not considered excessive.

THE EAST AND BOND ISSUES

In the eastern part of the country the bond plan for building State highways has not been received quite as enthusiastically as in the West and South, for the reason that the Eastern States have been building roads for many years and have seen them wear out in much shorter period than the life of the bond issue which financed them. But to-day roads are being constructed of concrete and are expected to wear at least until the bonds, with the proceeds of which they are built, are paid. In seven of the eight States that at the last election acted favorably upon bond issues or enabling acts, it was a novel experience, indicating that the bond plan of raising road money is gaining favor as an accepted method of financing good roads.

The good road may be a pleasure to the city man, but it is a necessity to the farmer. This was denied at one time. To-day it is no more disputed than is the multiplication table. Whatever a farmer may have, it is greatly depreciated if he be surrounded by bad roads. A splendid harvest may be sacrificed by inability to market it to an advantage because of bad roads preventing its transportation at the proper time. Whatever a farmer may lack he can easily obtain if he has a 365-day improved highway leading from his door to the market.

The value of almost any commodity is determined in a large measure by its accessibility to the market. The best farm or orchard or garden products in the world may be rendered valueless if they can not be marketed because of bad roads; they can easily be rendered unprofitable if they are marketed over roads so bad that the cost of hauling the product is excessively high. If his roads are so bad that he can only make one trip a day to his market the farmer thus situated pays twice as much to haul his products as the farmer who, because of good roads, can make two trips a day. Thus it works out that farms situated on good roads sell for far more per acre than farms situated on bad roads, although acre for acre the land may be the same as to fertility, drainage, etc.

EFFECT OF BAD ROADS

Nothing has contributed more to the drift from farm to town than the inability of the farmer and his family—particularly his children—to go to town when they should, or to go only under most uncomfortable circumstances. Bad roads mean difficult transportation; during some seasons of the year they mean practically no transportation. So long as man is a social animal, so long will he rebel against conditions which make difficult communication with his fellow man. So long as he strives for his mental and spiritual betterment, so long will he rebel against conditions which render it difficult for him to attend places of worship and send his children to school. So long as he strives to get ahead financially, so long will he rebel against conditions which handicap his marketing facilities and cut down, if not wipe out, his profit. Hence it is that bad roads drive people to the city and depreciate the value of land. The community of bad roads is also the community of poor schools, poor churches, poor farmers, and abandoned farms.

These facts have been brought home to the farmer with greater force since the introduction of the automobile and truck into rural life. The Bureau of Farm Management and Economics has just issued a bulletin upon Experience of Eastern Farmers with Motor Trucks, an analysis of the experience of 753 farmers of the New England States, New York, Pennsylvania, New Jersey, Delaware, and Maryland who use motor trucks on their own farms. The farms studied were of all sizes and types—truck farms, dairy farms, fruit farms, crop farms (raising no stock), and general farms, which produce all kinds of crops and raise livestock. There were more general farms studied than any other type, with truck farms second, dairy farms third, and fruit farms fourth. The farms ranged in size from the truck farm of a few acres to the general farm of several hundred acres. The average size of all farms studied was 173 acres. Only 18 per cent of the farms were 5 miles or less from market, while 25 per cent were 20 miles or more from market.

DAY OF THE TRUCK

Ninety-five per cent of the farmers said their trucks had proved a profitable investment; the trucks ranged in size from one-half ton to 5 tons. As compared with horses and wagons, the farmers reported the trucks saved from one-half to two-thirds of the

time required for hauling. Four-fifths of the farmers reported their trucks enabled them to save on hired help. On the average this saving amounted to \$324 a year. A very great number reported that since they had purchased trucks they had changed their market—going farther but to a larger market and thereby getting better prices.

But without any exception it was reported that good roads are essential to the economical use of trucks, and other motor vehicles. Sixty per cent of the complaints against motor trucks were on account of bad roads. The significance of this may be readily seen when the official figures of 1920 show that 60 per cent of the output of motor cars and trucks for 1920 were sold to agricultural districts; and over 2,500,000 motor cars and trucks registered in 1920 were owned by farmers.

The highway is the farmer's transportation system for both his passenger and freight traffic. It is absolutely as essential to him as the street-car lines are to the resident of the great cities and the steam railroads are to the great manufacturing industries. It is as deadly to agriculture to have the highways crippled part of the year or unfit for traffic at irregular intervals as it would be to industry to have no railroad transportation for weeks at a time or to a great city to have its street-car transportation out of business for days or weeks at a time.

THE GETTYSBURG ADDRESS

Fourscore and seven years ago our fathers brought forth on this continent a new Nation, conceived in liberty and dedicated to the proposition that all men are created equal.

Now we are engaged in a great Civil War, testing whether that Nation, or any nation so conceived and so dedicated can long endure.

We are met on a great battlefield of that war; we have come to dedicate a portion of that field as a final resting place for those who here gave their lives that that Nation might live. It is altogether fitting and proper that we should do this; but in a larger sense we can not dedicate, we can not consecrate, we can not hallow this ground. The brave men living and dead, who struggled here, have consecrated it far above our poor power to add or detract.

The world will little note nor long remember what we say here, but it can never forget what they did here. It is for us, the living, rather, to be dedicated here to the unfinished work which they who fought here have thus far so nobly advanced.

It is rather for us to be here dedicated to the great task remaining before us—that from these honored dead we take increased devotion to that cause for which they gave the last full measure of devotion; that we here highly resolve that these dead shall not have died in vain; that this Nation, under God, shall have a new birth of freedom; and that government of the people, by the people, for the people shall not perish from the earth.

Mr. BROOKHART. Mr. President, I ask leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial in the March of Events section of yesterday's Hearst newspapers in reference to Abraham Lincoln and the way his ideas and his policies and his career would fit into present conditions in the United States.

There being no objection, the matter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Ships tied up, freight trains idle, passenger cars empty, 12,000,000 men without work, business at a standstill, the Treasury bursting with gold, granaries overflowing with wheat, gigantic and unsalable crops, mines shut down, oil industry in cut-throat competition, farmers desperate, taking the law into their own hands in many States, factories idle, an active smokestack a curiosity, industry paralyzed. * * *

That's the picture of the United States in 1933.

If Lincoln could come back and see this picture to-day, on his one hundred and twenty-fourth birthday, he would surely ask himself, "What in Heaven's name is the matter with them? Too much of everything, yet they are all weeping."

And that is what we ask ourselves, "What in Heaven's name is the matter with us?"

Nobody answers that question satisfactorily; nobody even tries.

Europe has welched and will probably swindle us out of ten thousand million dollars, stupidly lent; but what of that? It is a trifle more than 10 per cent of one year's income of this country, in good times.

We are told, and it is true: "You are now paying for the war into which you entered so blithely." But with brains and courage, we should be able to pay for and come out of that foolishness with a lesson learned. The country has reached the point of facing things as they are and talking plain truths. Deceiving ourselves is no longer fashionable, necessary, or possible.

The idiotic "just-around-the-corner" period and theory have come to an end.

That theory moves out of Washington on the 4th of next month. What then?

What, in your opinion, will change this picture?

What will make Uncle Sam take his handkerchief away from his eyes, straighten himself up, and do something?

What will make industry and finance, oil and commerce, agriculture and mining stop crying and get to work and do something?

Must we have some kind of new system to pull us out of this depression rut?

The finest automobile in the world has to get help from a team of horses sometime when it goes into the ditch.

Do we need something more primitive than our present altogether lovely kind of government?

What is the matter with us?

What is your answer?

Can the country continue to be run by the men, the interests, the theories, the old-fashioned failure ideas that have got us into the ditch?

Will politicians appointed by conceited incompetents continue to dispose of the people's money, the national funds?

Will the twelve millions remain idle, hopeless and desperate, while tens and even hundreds of millions are shovelled out to "reconstruct" and make happy some of the very organizations that with their recklessness, stupidity, and short-sightedness are largely responsible for the present trouble?

What is the matter with us and who will remedy the trouble?

Will some man rise above our national picture of incompetence and depression, as Lincoln rises above America in distress, in this McCay cartoon?

Will the new man, if he comes, represent wisdom, careful planning, and experience, or will he come as constructive rulers have often come in the past, suddenly, from nowhere, like Lincoln in his day, from the farm and the wood-chopper's ax, like Mussolini from the grime of the war trenches, or Stalin from secret conspiring against the hideous government of the czars?

In the national mind there should be no question of revenge or punishment.

The United States has been run by a collection of sleek gentlemen, about as near to genius as the prize 1-year-old Hereford steer in a cattle show. They were fat, they were rich, they were printing their billions in nice paper securities, and the foolish people were buying them.

They knew a little about golf and thought they knew something about finance, but they didn't.

They rolled together hundreds of millions and thousands of millions, and thought the rolling would go on forever.

It did not.

Suddenly the beautiful dream faded, as suddenly as when a child dreaming of cans filled with ice cream falls out of bed.

Who or what will put the national child back to bed?

Look at them now, those "best minds," in this picture.

Look at their Government weeping dismally on its piles of gold, the kind of Government that has been built up by the control of money, for money, by money, without any citizenship interest, without the slightest care as to what was happening and might happen to the 123,000,000 human beings making up the population of the United States.

Every American, the rich man who has lost his fortune, the inheritor of wealth who finds that inherited wealth has melted, the man who has lost his job, the farmer who feeds the Nation and finds that it can not pay a decent price for its food, not enough to pay him for growing it, all must realize that what has happened is nobody's fault.

Our system is wrong, in some detail, or fundamentally, we do not know which.

We were building up a mountain of prosperity, with no foundation of common sense and sane methods under it.

Our system created thousands of fortunes, "on paper," and our greedy politicians taxed those imaginary fortunes as though they had been real.

And as the amount taxable diminished the amount of the tax was steadily increased.

When the war began the debt of the United States was one billion. After paying heaven knows how many billions to retire bonds the Government still owes more than twenty thousand million dollars; and that represents frozen capital, a sort of financial cyclone cellar in which the money of the country has taken refuge.

Twenty billions not spent, twenty billions locked up, twenty billions on which the people are taxed to pay nearly one thousand millions a year in interest, to those that hoard Government bonds and do not spend.

What is the matter with us?

We have everything that we ever had, and more of it. We have more gold than any country in the world. Of almost everything we have too much.

What will bring these giants of business, finance, and Government out of their crying fit, back to the world of work and determination?

No superman will do it.

To run the United States successfully is the business of the people of the United States.

They have neglected that business, leaving it to dishonest or incompetent politicians, while they pursued the quickly vanished dollar.

It is only themselves they have to blame, and it is some one of them that must come forth as Lincoln and others have done in the past, to do the work that must be done.

Meanwhile this unpleasant picture that meets Lincoln's birthday in 1933 is a picture of the United States as it is.

Who and what will change the picture?

CHANGE IN DATE OF THE INAUGURATION

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a letter from the Governor of Nevada, transmitting certified copy of a joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Nevada

ratifying a proposed amendment to the Constitution of the United States fixing the commencement of the terms of President and Vice President and Members of Congress, and fixing the time of the assembling of Congress, which, with the accompanying papers, was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATE OF NEVADA, EXECUTIVE CHAMBER,
Carson City, February 8, 1933.

HON. CHARLES F. CURTIS,

Vice President, President of Senate,

Washington, D. C.

ESTEEMED SIR: In compliance with the terms of Assembly Joint Resolution No. 1 of the thirty-sixth session of the Nevada Legislature, I have the honor to transmit herewith certified copy of such resolution.

A similar copy has been transmitted to the President of the United States, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and to the Secretary of State of the United States.

Very truly yours,

F. B. BALZAR, Governor.

Assembly joint resolution ratifying a proposed amendment to the Constitution of the United States fixing the commencement of the terms of President and Vice President and Members of Congress and fixing the time of the assembling of Congress

Whereas both Houses of the Seventy-second Congress of the United States of America, by a constitutional majority of two-thirds thereof, made the following proposition to amend the Constitution of the United States of America in the following words, to wit:

"Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, fixing the commencement of the terms of President and Vice President and Members of Congress, and fixing the time of the assembling of Congress

"Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled (two-thirds of each House concurring therein), That the following amendment to the Constitution be, and hereby is, proposed to the States, to become valid as a part of said Constitution when ratified by the legislatures of the several States as provided in the Constitution:

"ARTICLE —

"SECTION 1. The terms of the President and Vice President shall end at noon on the 20th day of January, and the terms of Senators and Representatives at noon on the 3d day of January, of the years in which such terms would have ended if this article had not been ratified; and the terms of their successors shall then begin.

"SEC. 2. The Congress shall assemble at least once in every year, and such meeting shall begin at noon on the 3d day of January unless they shall by law appoint a different day.

"SEC. 3. If at the time fixed for the beginning of the term of the President the President elect shall have died, the Vice President elect shall become President. If a President shall not have been chosen before the time fixed for the beginning of his term, or if the President elect shall have failed to qualify, then the Vice President elect shall act as President until a President shall have qualified; and the Congress may by law provide for the case wherein neither a President elect nor a Vice President elect shall have qualified, declaring who shall then act as President, or the manner in which one who is to act shall be selected, and such person shall act accordingly until a President or Vice President shall have qualified.

"SEC. 4. The Congress may by law provide for the case of the death of any of the persons from whom the House of Representatives may choose a President whenever the right of choice shall have devolved upon them, and for the case of the death of any of the persons from whom the Senate may choose a Vice President whenever the right of choice shall have devolved upon them.

"SEC. 5. Sections 1 and 2 shall take effect on the 15th day of October following the ratification of this article.

"SEC. 6. This article shall be inoperative unless it shall have been ratified as an amendment to the Constitution by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States within seven years from the date of its submission":

Therefore be it

Resolved by the Assembly and the Senate of the State of Nevada, That the said proposed amendment to the Constitution of the United States of America be, and the same is hereby, ratified by the Legislature of the State of Nevada, and that certified copies of this preamble and joint resolution be forwarded by the governor of this State to the President of the United States of America, to the Presiding Officer of the United States Senate, and to the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States, and to the Secretary of State of the United States.

FRED S. ALWARD,
Speaker of the Assembly.

GEORGE BRODIGAN,
Chief Clerk of the Assembly.

MORLEY GRISWOLD,
President of the Senate.

V. R. MERALDO,
Secretary of the Senate.

STATE OF NEVADA,
EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENT.

Approved January 28, 1933, 2.17 p. m.

F. B. BALZAR, Governor.

STATE OF NEVADA,

Department of State, ss:

I, W. G. Greathouse, the duly elected, qualified, and acting secretary of state of the State of Nevada, do hereby certify that the foregoing is a true, full, and correct copy of the original assembly joint resolution ratifying a proposed amendment to the Constitution of the United States, fixing the commencement of the terms of President and Vice President and Members of Congress and fixing the time of the assembling of Congress.

Now on file and of record in this office.

In witness whereof I have hereunto set my hand and affixed the great seal of State at my office in Carson City, Nev., this 30th day of January, A. D. 1933.

[SEAL.]

W. G. GREATHOUSE,
Secretary of State.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of South Carolina, which was referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads:

A concurrent resolution memorializing Congress of the United States to enact House Joint Resolution 191 commemorating the one hundred and fiftieth anniversary of the naturalization as an American citizen, in 1783, of Brig. Gen. Thaddeus Kosciuszko, a hero of the Revolutionary War, by issuing special series of postage stamps in honor of Brig. Gen. Thaddeus Kosciuszko

Whereas on October 13, 1933, will occur the one hundred and fiftieth anniversary of the naturalization as an American citizen of Brig. Gen. Thaddeus Kosciuszko, a hero of the Revolutionary War; and

Whereas the service rendered by him was of great value and assistance to the cause of American independence and of such high importance that on October 13, 1783, he was appointed brevet brigadier general of the Continental Army and was granted him naturalization as an American citizen; and

Whereas it is but fitting that proper recognition should be given to the memory of Brig. Gen. Thaddeus Kosciuszko, whose illustrious service in the war for American independence is well known to all who are familiar with our history: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the house of representatives (the senate concurring). That the General Assembly of the State of South Carolina hereby respectfully requests and urges his excellency, Hon. Herbert Hoover, President of the United States, Members of the House of Representatives and Senators of the Senate from the State of South Carolina be authorized to respectfully memorialize the United States Congress to enact legislation which will provide for the effective carrying out of the provisions of the said bill whereby the Postmaster General would be authorized and directed to issue a special series of postage stamps of the denomination of 3 cents, of such design and for such period as he may determine, commemorative of the hundred and fiftieth anniversary of the naturalization as an American citizen and appointment of Thaddeus Kosciuszko as brevet brigadier general of the Continental Army on October 13, 1783.

That a copy of this resolution be sent to the President of the United States, Vice President of the United States, Speaker of the House of Representatives, and to each United States Senator and Representative in Congress from South Carolina.

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Columbia, S. C., February 10, 1933.

I hereby certify that the foregoing is a true and correct copy of a resolution adopted by the House of Representatives of South Carolina and concurred in by the South Carolina Senate.

[SEAL.]

J. WILSON GIBBES,
Clerk of the House.

He also presented a letter from Martin Krauss, of New York City, N. Y., inclosing copy of a night letter addressed to the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. HARRISON] relative to his plan for the solution of present economic difficulties, which, with the accompanying paper, was referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also laid before the Senate a letter from F. G. Swanson, Esq., of Tyler, Tex., inclosing an editorial from the Dallas (Tex.) Journal of the 8th instant bearing "on what may be included under constitutional rights of freedom of thought and of speech and of the press in connection with an article recently published by a Sergeant at Arms of the Senate," and also making certain suggestions relating to publication of alleged "lists of clients on regular retainer and * * * securities" of Senators, etc., which, with the accompanying clipping, was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented a resolution adopted by the Common Council of the City of Buffalo, N. Y., favoring the passage of legislation providing for the issuance of a special series of postage stamps to commemorate an anniversary of Brig. Gen. Thaddeus Kosciuszko, which was referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

He also laid before the Senate resolutions of the Leavenworth (Kans.) Rotary Club, protesting against the appropriation of Government funds for the purpose of devising, creating, and conducting a program of Government-supervised camp activities for the so-called wandering youth of the Nation, which were ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. SHEPPARD presented memorials of 65 citizens of Portland, 76 citizens of El Campo, 31 citizens of San Antonio, 137 citizens of Big Spring, 112 citizens of Beaumont, 24 citizens of Whittenburg, 246 citizens of Corsicana, 85 citizens of Pecos and Mentone, and 710 citizens of Galveston, all in the State of Texas, remonstrating against the passage of legislation legalizing the manufacture and sale of beer, which were ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. CAPPER presented resolutions adopted by the Independent Methodist Episcopal Sunday School, of Bayneville; the Woman's Foreign Missionary Society, of Burlington; the Baptist Women's Missionary Union, of Osawatomie; the Ladies' Aid Society of the Methodist Episcopal Church of Topeka, and local chapters of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Bayneville, Kismet, Ogallah, and Osawatomie, all in the State of Kansas, favoring the passage of legislation to regulate and supervise the motion-picture industry, which were ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. WALCOTT presented petitions and papers in the nature of petitions from Milardo-Wilcox Unit, Post No. 75, of Middletown; Hayes-Velhage Unit, No. 96, of West Hartford; Gray-Dickinson Post, No. 59, of Windsor; Russell K. Bourne D. S. C. Post, No. 23, of Wethersfield; Horace J. Tanguay Unit, No. 80, of Thompsonville; and Tomalonis-Hall Unit, No. 84, of Simsbury, all of the American Legion Auxiliary, in the State of Connecticut, praying for the creation of a separate veterans' committee of the Senate, which were ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented a resolution adopted by Eddy-Glover Post, No. 6, the American Legion, of New Britain, Conn., favoring the carrying out of the provisions of the national defense act of 1920, which was ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented memorials and papers in the nature of memorials of Y D Post, No. 130, the American Legion, of New Haven; Brock-Barnes Post, the American Legion Auxiliary, of Plainville; and Milardo-Wilcox Unit, Post No. 75, the American Legion Auxiliary, of Middletown, all in the State of Connecticut, remonstrating against reduction in the pay and allowances of officers and personnel of the Army and Navy, which were ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented a resolution adopted by the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Thomaston, Conn., protesting against the repeal of the eighteenth amendment to the Constitution or the repeal or modification of the national prohibition law, which was ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented petitions and papers in the nature of petitions from Unit No. 4, Robert O. Fletcher Auxiliary, of Norwich; James J. Shea Unit, No. 19, of Willimantic; and Eddy-Glover Unit, No. 6, of New Britain, all of the American Legion Auxiliary in the State of Connecticut, praying for the passage of the so-called widows and orphans' pension bill, which were referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. SHORTRIDGE. Mr. President, I am in receipt of two certified copies of a resolution recently adopted by the Board of Directors of the City of Pasadena, Calif., expressing the attitude of that city toward proposed legislation by Congress on the subject of taxation affecting municipally owned public utilities.

I present these resolutions in the Senate and request that they be referred to the Committee on Finance.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolutions will be received and referred to the Committee on Finance.

(The resolution of the Board of Directors of the City of Pasadena, Calif., presented by Mr. SHORTRIDGE, protests against the passage of any Federal taxation measure which imposes or may be interpreted as imposing a burden upon the States, State agencies, or publicly owned utilities.)

RECOGNITION OF SERVICES OF WORLD WAR VETERANS

Mr. ASHURST. Mr. President, I present a communication in the nature of a memorial from the Board of Super-

visors of Pima County, Ariz., relative to recognition of the services of World War veterans, which I ask may be printed in the RECORD and lie on the table.

There being no objection, the communication was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HON. HENRY F. ASHURST,

United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR ASHURST: The Board of Supervisors of Pima County, State of Arizona, in regular meeting assembled on this 6th day of February, 1933, respectfully memorializes the Congress of the United States to consider the services rendered by the veterans of the World War and refrain from reducing or eliminating any of the benefits now accruing to them, as such reduction or elimination would result in untold hardship upon these worthy veterans and would increase the already heavy burden now being borne by this county and all other counties in this State.

Due to the fact that the ex-service men who would be affected are mostly either bedridden or unable to follow continuously a substantially gainful occupation it would be practically compulsory for the respective counties of the State to provide them with the proper hospitalization and the necessities of life. We feel that the Federal Government owes a moral obligation to these veterans and should continue to hospitalize them and compensate and pension them for their disabilities.

Therefore you are respectfully requested to submit this memorial to the Senate of the United States and request that it be published in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Respectfully submitted.

GEORGE H. ANKLAM,
Chairman Board of Supervisors.

JAY C. HICKS,
Member of Board.

W. R. DENISON
(Unable to attend meeting).

I hereby certify that Mr. W. R. Denison was unable to attend the above meeting, but gave me his verbal consent to this memorial.
[SEAL.]

GLADSTONE MACKENZIE,
Clerk Board of Supervisors.

Mr. ASHURST also presented a letter embodying a memorial of the Tucson City Council from the mayor of Tucson, Ariz., which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HON. HENRY F. ASHURST,

United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: The City Council of the City of Tucson, county of Pima, State of Arizona, in regular meeting assembled on the 6th day of February, 1933, respectfully memorializes the Congress of the United States to consider the services rendered by the veterans of the World War and refrain from reducing or eliminating any of the benefits now accruing to them, as such reduction or elimination would result in untold hardship upon these worthy veterans and would increase the already heavy burden now being borne by the city of Tucson, by the county of Pima, and the State of Arizona.

Due to the fact that the ex-service men who would be affected under the proposed reduction or elimination of benefits put forth by certain organizations under the guise of economy are mostly either bedridden or unable to follow continuously a substantially gainful occupation, it would be practically compulsory for the city of Tucson, county of Pima, and the State of Arizona to provide them with the proper hospitalization and the necessities of life. We feel that the Federal Government owes them a moral obligation, and should continue to hospitalize, compensate, and pension them for their disabilities and their service in time of need.

Therefore you are respectfully requested to submit this memorial to the Senate of the United States and request that it be published in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Respectfully submitted.

GEO. K. SMITH,
Mayor City of Tucson, Ariz.

Attest:
[SEAL.]

CHARLES C. IRVIN,
City Clerk City of Tucson, Ariz.

DELIVERY OF WATER FROM THE COLORADO RIVER

Mr. ASHURST. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD and appropriately referred correspondence between the Secretary of the Interior and the Governor of Arizona relating to the form of a water-delivery contract.

There being no objection, the correspondence was referred to the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR,
Washington, February 10, 1933.

HON. HENRY F. ASHURST,

United States Senate.

MY DEAR SENATOR ASHURST: Inclosed is a copy of a letter which I am to-day sending Governor Moeur. A similar letter has been

written to Messrs. Ross, Favour, and Cragin, who, I understand, are members of the new Colorado River Commission. Inclosed also are additional copies of the press release of February 13 and my regulations of February 7, which will be released on that date.

Very truly yours,

RAY LYMAN WILBUR.

THE SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR,
Washington, February 10, 1933.

HON. B. B. MOEUR,
*Governor of Arizona,
Phoenix, Ariz.*

MY DEAR GOVERNOR MOEUR: I am inclosing a copy of letter which I have written to each of the members of Arizona's Colorado River Commission, together with a copy of regulations which I have signed as of February 7, and which will be released February 13. I earnestly desire to see Arizona's interests placed on an assured basis.

The inclosed regulations will assure Arizona a part of what she has contended for, without prejudice to her right to acquire further interests in the Colorado later, and without requiring negotiations between Arizona and the other States.

I earnestly trust it will be possible to conclude such a contract while I am in office and while the personnel familiar with the background of these problems is available.

If you believe it feasible to attempt to conclude such an agreement, I will have representatives attend in Phoenix for that purpose.

Very truly yours,

RAY LYMAN WILBUR, *Secretary.*

BOULDER CANYON PROJECT

REGULATIONS—DELIVERY OF WATER IN ARIZONA

I. These regulations are promulgated to further the peaceful enjoyment by Arizona, California, and Nevada of the waters of the Colorado River. They state the form of a water-delivery contract which the United States will enter into with the State of Arizona, subject to certain conditions stated below.

II. The authorization for a contract provided in these regulations shall remain in force only for so long a period as the State of Arizona and claimants to the use of water therein do not interfere, by litigation or otherwise, with diversions of other holders, present and future, of water contracts with the United States and with diversion works constructed by or for them or the United States. In the event of such interference these regulations and the authorization herein contained shall thereupon become void.

III. The United States, subject to the foregoing conditions, will enter into a contract with the State of Arizona in substantially the form stated in Exhibit A, hereto annexed as a part hereof.

RAY LYMAN WILBUR,
Secretary of the Interior.

FEBRUARY 7, 1933.

(Exhibit A; part of regulations of February 7, 1933)

UNITED STATES,
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,
BUREAU OF RECLAMATION.

BOULDER CANYON PROJECT

Contract for delivery of water

This contract, made this.....day of....., 1933, pursuant to the act of Congress approved June 17, 1902 (32 Stat. 388), and acts amendatory thereof and supplemental thereto, all of which acts are commonly known and referred to as the reclamation law, and particularly pursuant to the act of Congress approved December 21, 1928 (45 Stat. 1057), designated the Boulder Canyon project act, between the United States of America, hereinafter referred to as the United States, acting for this purpose by Ray Lyman Wilbur, Secretary of the Interior, hereinafter styled the Secretary, and the State of Arizona, acting for this purpose by.....

Witnesseth:

Explanatory recitals

2. Whereas pursuant to the direction of the said Boulder Canyon project act, the Secretary has caused to be let a contract for the construction of a dam, known and referred to hereinafter as Hoover Dam, in the main stream of the Colorado River at Black Canyon, and said dam will create at the date of completion a storage reservoir having a maximum water-surface elevation at about 1,229 feet above sea level (United States Geological Survey datum) and a capacity of about 30,500,000 acre-feet; and

3. Whereas the Secretary is required by the said Boulder Canyon project act to use said dam and the reservoir created thereby, first for river regulation, improvement of navigation and flood control; second, for irrigation and domestic use, and the satisfaction of perfected rights in pursuance of Article VIII of the Colorado River compact, and third, for power; and

4. Whereas said Boulder Canyon project act authorizes the Secretary, under such general regulations as he may prescribe, to contract for the storage of water in said reservoir and for delivery thereof at such points on the river as may be agreed upon, and provides further that no person shall have or be entitled to have the use for any purpose of the water stored as aforesaid, except by contract made as therein stated; and

5. Whereas the Secretary has heretofore promulgated regulations dated April 23, 1930, amended September 28, 1931, authorizing the execution of certain other water-delivery contracts, and it is the desire of the parties to this agreement to contract for the storage of waters for use on lands in Arizona, and to assure the peaceful and uninterrupted performance of all such contracts, including this; and

6. Whereas by direction of Congress, water has been reserved and appropriated for lands within the Colorado River Indian Reservation in Arizona, unaffected by the Colorado River compact by virtue of Article VII thereof; and

7. Whereas the United States and the State of Arizona, contemplating the future construction of other reclamation projects, and desiring to avoid claims by foreign water users to waters stored by Hoover Dam to the detriment of said projects, desire to provide for the storage of certain quantities of water for the benefit of lands in Arizona without prejudice to whatever right the parties may have hereafter to contract as to additional quantities of water; and

8. Whereas the diversion works in the Colorado River contemplated for certain of the contractors under said regulations of April 23, 1930, amended September 28, 1931, particularly the proposed Imperial Dam, and the proposed dam for the Metropolitan Water District of Southern California, near Parker, will be of service for delivery of waters covered by this contract, and it is essential to the purpose of this contract that the building of said works, when approved by the United States, shall not be interfered with:

9. Now, therefore, in consideration of the mutual covenants herein contained, the parties hereto agree as follows, to wit:

Delivery of water by the United States

10. From storage available in the reservoir created by Hoover Dam, the United States will deliver under this contract each year at points of diversion hereinafter referred to on the Colorado River so much available water as may be necessary to enable the beneficial consumptive use in Arizona of not to exceed 2,800,000 acre-feet annually by all diversions effected from the Colorado River and its tributaries below Lee Ferry (but in addition to all uses from waters of the Gila River and its tributaries), subject to the following provisions:

(a) This contract is without prejudice to the claims of the State of Arizona and States in the upper basin as to their respective rights in and to waters of the Colorado River, and relates only to water physically available for delivery in the lower basin under the terms hereof.

(b) The United States does not undertake by this contract to deliver water above Hoover Dam; but the obligation to deliver water below Hoover Dam shall be diminished to the extent that consumptive uses in Arizona effected by diversions from the Colorado River and its tributaries below Lee Ferry diminish the inflow to the reservoir.

(c) It is recognized by the parties hereto that differences of opinion may exist between the State of Arizona and other contractors as to what part of the water contracted for by each falls within Article III (a) of the Colorado River compact, what part within Article III (b) thereof, what part is surplus water under said compact, what part is unaffected by said compact, and what part is affected by various provisions of section 4 (a) of the Boulder Canyon project act. Accordingly, while the United States undertakes to supply water from the regulated discharge of Hoover Dam waters in quantities stated by this contract, as well as contracts heretofore or hereafter made pursuant to regulations of April 23, 1930, amended September 28, 1931, this contract is without prejudice to relative claims of priorities as between the State of Arizona and other contractors with the United States, and shall not otherwise impair any contract heretofore authorized by said regulations.

(d) This contract is without prejudice to the right of the United States to make further disposition of water available for use in the Lower Colorado River Basin not heretofore allocated by regulations nor herein contracted for, or to the respective claims of the States of Arizona, New Mexico, Utah, California, and Nevada, and of Mexico, to such additional water.

(e) The water provided for in this contract shall be delivered continuously, so far as reasonable diligence will permit, to the extent such water is beneficially used for irrigation and domestic purposes. The United States reserves the right to discontinue or temporarily reduce the amount of water to be delivered for the purpose of investigation, inspection, maintenance, repairs, replacement, or installation of equipment and/or machinery at Hoover Dam, but so far as feasible will give reasonable notice in advance of such temporary discontinuance or reduction. The United States, its officers, agents, and employees, shall not be liable for damages when for any reason whatsoever suspensions or reductions in delivery of water occur.

Subordinate contracts authorized

11. Deliveries of water subject to the terms of this contract may be made for lands within any Indian reservation in Arizona, and to any individual, irrigation district, corporation, or any political subdivision of the State of Arizona, which may qualify under the reclamation law or other Federal statute. Contracts with such water users for such deliveries, subject to the terms of this contract, may be made by the Secretary in his discretion. Such contracts and deliveries made thereunder shall be deemed as made in discharge, pro tanto, of the obligations of this contract.

Points of diversion—Measurement of water

12. The water to be delivered under this contract shall be measured at the points of diversion, or elsewhere as the Secretary may direct, by measuring and controlling devices or automatic gages approved by the Secretary, which, however, shall be furnished, installed, and maintained by the State of Arizona, or the users of water. Said measuring and controlling devices or automatic gages shall be subject to the inspection of the United States, whose authorized representatives may at all times have access to them, and any deficiencies or inaccuracies found shall be promptly corrected. The United States shall be under no obligation to deliver any water which may be diverted at points at which such devices are not maintained, but in the event that diversions are made at points where measuring and controlling devices or automatic gages are not maintained in accordance with this contract, the Secretary shall estimate the quantity of the diversions and his determination shall be final.

Records of water deliveries

13. The State of Arizona shall cause to be made by water users or otherwise monthly reports on forms to be supplied by the United States of all water diverted from the Colorado River. Such reports shall be made by the 5th day of the month immediately succeeding the month in which the water is delivered.

No charges for delivery of water

14. No charge shall be made for water or for the use, storage or delivery of water for irrigation, or water for potable purposes, in Arizona.

No Arizona diversions to be made except pursuant hereto—Diversions in other States

15. It is the object of this contract to assure to those (including the State of Arizona) who have contracted or may hereafter contract with the United States for delivery of waters stored by Hoover Dam, the quiet performance of their respective contracts. It is accordingly agreed that:

(a) The State of Arizona will hereafter grant no permits for, nor otherwise authorize, uses of the waters of the Colorado River and its tributaries (other than the Gila River and its tributaries), except subject to the terms of this contract.

(b) The State of Arizona and its permittees will not interfere by litigation or otherwise, with deliveries of water under any contract between the United States and water users in the State of Nevada, or any contract made pursuant to regulations dated April 23, 1930, amended September 28, 1931, nor with the construction of diversion works by or for the holder thereof, nor with diversions of other uses affected by such works, unless and until such contractor interferes, by litigation or otherwise, with the enjoyment of this contract. But in the event of such interference by any other such contractor with the enjoyment of this contract, the State may, at its election, either rely on this contract, or assert all rights which the State or any water user therein would have had against such party if this contract had not been made.

(c) Breach by the State of any of the provisions of this article shall entitle the United States at its option to cancel this contract and any or all subordinate contracts referred to in article 11.

Duration of contract

16. This contract is for permanent service, subject to the provisions contained in the preceding article.

Disputes and disagreements

17. Whenever a controversy arises out of this contract, and if the parties hereto then agree to submit the matter to arbitration, the State of Arizona shall name one arbitrator and the Secretary shall name one arbitrator, and the two arbitrators thus chosen shall elect three other arbitrators within 15 days after their first meeting, but in the event of their failure to name all or any of the three arbitrators within 30 days after their first meeting, such arbitrators, not so elected, shall be named by the senior judge of the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit. The decision of any three of the five shall be a valid and binding award.

Rules and regulations

18. The Secretary may prescribe and enforce rules and regulations governing the delivery and diversion of water hereunder, but such rules and regulations shall be promulgated, modified, revised, and/or extended from time to time only after notice to the State of Arizona and opportunity for it to be heard.

Agreement subject to Colorado River compact

19. As required by section 13 (c) of the Boulder Canyon project act, this contract is made upon the express condition and with the express understanding that all rights hereunder shall be subject to and controlled by the Colorado River compact, being the compact or agreement signed at Santa Fe, N. Mex., November 24, 1922, pursuant to act of Congress approved August 19, 1921, entitled "An act to permit a compact or agreement between the States of Arizona, California, Colorado, Nevada, New Mexico, Utah, and Wyoming respecting the disposition and apportionment of the waters of the Colorado River, and for other purposes," as approved by the Boulder Canyon project act, but is without prejudice to the respective contentions of the State of Arizona and of the parties to said compact, as to interpretation thereof.

Effective date of contract

20. This contract shall take effect when an act of the Legislature of Arizona ratifying it shall have become effective, but within two years of the date hereof.

Interest in contract not transferable

21. No interest in or under this contract shall be transferable by either party without the written consent of the other.

Member-of-Congress clause

22. No Member of or Delegate to Congress or Resident Commissioner shall be admitted to any share or part of this contract, or to any benefit that may arise therefrom. Nothing, however, herein contained shall be considered to extend to this contract if made with a corporation for its general benefit.

In witness whereof the parties hereto have caused this contract to be executed the day and year first above written.

THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,
By RAY LYMAN WILBUR,
Secretary of the Interior.

Attest:

THE STATE OF ARIZONA,
By _____,
FEBRUARY 7, 1933.

Approved as to form.

(Signed) RAY LYMAN WILBUR,
Secretary of the Interior.

The foregoing contract was ratified by act of the Legislature of Arizona which became effective _____, 193—, true copy of which is hereto annexed.

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR.

(Memorandum for the press, released for February 13, 1933)

Secretary Wilbur announced to-day promulgation of regulations assuring to Arizona a share of the water of the Colorado River.

Negotiations between Arizona and California for an allocation of main-stream waters, although undertaken on several occasions under the department's auspices, have been unsuccessful.

Arizona has heretofore insisted in negotiations with other States upon 2,800,000 acre-feet of main-stream water plus one-half of any excess.

These regulations state the form of a contract to which it is proposed that the United States and Arizona be the sole parties.

The proposed contract would be an undertaking by the United States to deliver from Hoover Dam enough water each year to enable total main-stream uses in Arizona of 2,800,000 feet, leaving without prejudice and to future negotiations the disposition of any water available in excess of that amount. In the form of a water-delivery contract, this agreement would parallel generally the water contracts previously made or approved by the Secretary between the United States and California interests. The proposed contract recites the existence of a controversy between Arizona and the other States over the proper construction of the Colorado River compact and the Boulder Canyon project act, and as to how much water is available to Arizona under the various classifications made by the compact. It leaves these questions of priorities to future agreement or adjudication, assuring Arizona the delivery of a total amount of water, but without assigning its relative priorities.

Hoover Dam, the construction of which was authorized after the Colorado River compact was executed, has introduced an entirely new factor in the apportionment of waters in the lower Colorado Basin. It will provide about 30,000,000 acre-feet of storage or two years' flow of the river. This makes it possible to arrange for this distribution of water at the present time.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

Mr. ASHURST, from the Committee on Indian Affairs, to which was referred the bill (S. 5190) to amend the description of land described in section 1 of the act approved February 14, 1931, entitled "An act to authorize the President of the United States to establish the Canyon De Chelly National Monument within the Navajo Indian Reservation, Ariz.," reported it without amendment and submitted a report (No. 1211) thereon.

Mr. FRAZIER, from the Committee on Indian Affairs, to which was referred the bill (S. 5302) to amend the act entitled "An act to grant to the State of New York and the Seneca Nation of Indians jurisdiction over the taking of fish and game within the Allegany, Cattaraugus, and Oil Spring Indian Reservations," approved January 5, 1927, reported it with amendments and submitted a report (No. 1217) thereon.

Mr. TOWNSEND, from the Committee on Claims, to which was referred the bill (S. 4380) for the relief of Patrick Henry Walsh, reported it with an amendment and submitted a report (No. 1212) thereon.

Mr. BRATTON, from the Committee on the Judiciary, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 13655) to amend the act of May 10, 1928, entitled "An act to provide for the times and places for holding court for the eastern district of North Carolina" (45 Stat. 495), reported it without amendment and submitted a report (No. 1213) thereon.

Mr. GRAMMER, from the Committee on the District of Columbia, to which was referred the bill (S. 5470) authoriz-

ing the sale of certain property no longer required for public purposes in the District of Columbia, reported it without amendment and submitted a report (No. 1214) thereon.

AMENDMENT OF BANKRUPTCY LAW

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. President, from the Committee on the Judiciary I report favorably the bill (S. 5394) to amend section 57 of the act entitled "An act to establish a uniform system of bankruptcy throughout the United States," approved July 1, 1898, as amended and supplemented, with respect to proof and allowance of claims by trustees for bondholders, with amendments, and submit a report (No. 1216) thereon.

Also, from the same committee, I report favorably the bill (H. R. 14359) to amend an act entitled "An act to establish a uniform system of bankruptcy throughout the United States," approved July 1, 1898, and acts amendatory thereof and supplementary thereto. I report the bill with an amendment and submit a report (No. 1215) thereon.

The report on the House bill has not yet been completed, and I ask unanimous consent to file the proposed amendment to that bill, and that I be given another day or so in which to file the necessary report.

Mr. ASHURST. Mr. President, will not the able Senator indicate just what the bills are?

Mr. HASTINGS. The first one is a bill which amends the general bankruptcy law in a way everybody seems to think is desirable. There is no controversy about that. The other is the House bill providing for amendment of the bankruptcy law, about which there is a great deal of controversy. It was ordered favorably reported by the Committee on the Judiciary this morning.

Mr. COUZENS. Mr. President, as I understand it, that bill has eliminated all reference to the railroads. Is that true?

Mr. HASTINGS. The subcommittee submitted to the Committee on the Judiciary a bankruptcy bill involving four new sections, one relative to individual debtors, one relative to corporate reorganization, one to railroads engaged in interstate commerce, and the fourth section, being section 77, pertaining to farmers alone. The Committee on the Judiciary did not have an opportunity to consider the corporate reorganization section and the railroad section sufficiently to enable the Senate, in its judgment, to pass upon those questions at this time, and therefore reached the conclusion that we should report the first and last sections, the one pertaining to the individual debtor, and the other to the farmer, as a substitute for the bill which had been passed by the House.

Mr. COUZENS. As I understood the Senator, he said the Committee on the Judiciary had abandoned the bill to reorganize the railroads during the present session?

Mr. HASTINGS. That is true.

Mr. COUZENS. That would indicate that we ought to suspend the lending of money to the railroads, if that is to be the recommendation of the committee.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bills will be placed on the Calendar.

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. COPELAND:

A bill (S. 5627) to repeal the act entitled "An act to authorize the acquisition for military purposes of land in Orange County, N. Y., for use as an addition to the West Point Military Reservation," approved March 3, 1931; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. FRAZIER (by request):

A bill (S. 5628) to define the exterior boundaries of the Navajo Indian Reservation in New Mexico, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. DAVIS (by request):

A bill (S. 5629) to provide for needy blind persons of the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. COPELAND:

A bill (S. 5630) to authorize the payment of taxes and assessments on family dwelling houses in the District of Columbia in quarterly installments, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

(By request.) A bill (S. 5631) to authorize the delivery of surplus forfeited vessels of the Treasury Department to the Boy Scouts of America for use in sea scout training; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BLACK:

A bill (S. 5632) to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a railroad bridge and/or a toll bridge across the water between the mainland at or near Cedar Point and Dauphin Island, Ala.; to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. FRAZIER:

A bill (S. 5633) to restore to national farm-loan associations commissions illegally withheld by Federal land banks and to assure payment of such commissions hereafter; and

A bill (S. 5634) to reimburse national farm-loan associations for losses sustained on account of illegal denial of the privilege of obtaining their funds in the form of farm-loan bonds instead of cash; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. NORBECK:

A bill (S. 5635) to further extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across the Missouri River at or near Niobrara, Nebr.; to the Committee on Commerce.

LEASES OF NAVAL PETROLEUM RESERVES

Mr. NYE. Mr. President, I introduce a joint resolution, which I ask may be read at length and referred to the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys.

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 253) authorizing the Attorney General, with the concurrence of the Secretary of the Navy, to release claims of the United States upon certain assets of the Pan American Petroleum Co. and the Richfield Oil Co. of California, and others in connection with collections upon a certain judgment in favor of the United States against the Pan American Petroleum Co. heretofore duly entered, was read the first time by its title, the second time at length, and referred to the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That the Attorney General of the United States, with the concurrence of the Secretary of the Navy, be, and he is hereby, authorized, in connection with collection of amounts due the United States of America under a certain judgment for \$9,277,666.17, entered in the office of the clerk of the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of California, at Los Angeles, on January 14, 1933, against the Pan American Petroleum Co., a corporation, to release from claim or lien under said judgment such part or portions of the property and assets of the said Pan American Petroleum Co. and the Richfield Oil Co. of California, in such manner and with such reservations as shall seem to him proper and advisable, in consideration of payments to the United States to apply upon said judgment of not less than the sum of approximately \$5,000,000, and, in connection therewith, to release any claim of the United States against purchasers of oil and petroleum products from the leases commonly known as "E," "I," and "G" leases, or also known as Visalia 010042, 010043, and 010097 leases in naval petroleum reserve No. 1, Kern County, Calif., and to consent, in the premises, to the assignment of other oil and gas leases in said naval petroleum reserve No. 1, now part of the unmortgaged assets of Pan American Petroleum Co., with the concurrence of the Secretary of the Navy and to the assignment of other oil and gas leases, also part of the unmortgaged assets of Pan American Petroleum Co., of the United States outside the said naval petroleum reserve No. 1, with the consent of the Secretary of the Interior, said assignments to be authorized only to assignees otherwise duly qualified under existing laws.

HOUSE BILL REFERRED

The bill (H. R. 5261) for the relief of Sard S. Reed, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Claims.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE

Mr. FESS. Mr. President, a bill (S. 5189) to amend section 1 of the act entitled "An act to provide books for the adult blind," approved March 3, 1931, was introduced by the Senator from Utah [Mr. SMOOT], and referred to the Committee on Education and Labor. An identical bill, the

bill (H. R. 13817) to amend section 1 of the act entitled "An act to provide books for the adult blind," approved March 3, 1931, came over from the House of Representatives and was referred to the Committee on the Library. I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Library be discharged from the further consideration of the House bill and that it may be referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

AMENDMENT TO WAR DEPARTMENT APPROPRIATION BILL

Mr. BROOKHART submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to House bill 14199, the War Department appropriation bill, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed, as follows:

On page 61, after line 6, to insert the following:

"NATIONAL BOARD FOR PROMOTION OF RIFLE PRACTICE, ARMY NATIONAL MATCHES

"For the national matches and other competitions and the Small Arms Firing School, in accordance with the provisions of the act approved May 28, 1923 (U. S. C., Supp. III, title 32, secs. 181a, 181b), \$450,000."

APPLICATION FOR LOAN BY CAMELBACK WATER CONSERVATION DISTRICT

Mr. ASHURST submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 356), which was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency:

Whereas the Camelback Water Conservation District, organized under the laws of the State of Arizona, made application to the Reconstruction Finance Corporation for a loan; and

Whereas the loan thus applied for by the said Camelback Water Conservation District has been refused by the said Reconstruction Finance Corporation: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the said Reconstruction Finance Corporation is hereby respectfully directed to transmit to the Senate a copy of all of the protests and objections, if any, that were filed with the said Reconstruction Finance Corporation in opposition to the said application of the said Camelback Water Conservation District for a loan.

APPLICATION FOR LOAN BY VERDE RIVER IRRIGATION AND POWER DISTRICT

Mr. ASHURST submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 357), which was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency:

Whereas the Verde River Irrigation and Power District, organized under the laws of the State of Arizona, made application to the Reconstruction Finance Corporation for a loan; and

Whereas the loan thus applied for by the said Verde River Irrigation and Power District has been refused by the said Reconstruction Finance Corporation: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the said Reconstruction Finance Corporation is hereby respectfully directed to transmit to the Senate a copy of all of the protests and objections, if any, that were filed with the said Reconstruction Finance Corporation in opposition to the said application of the said Verde River Irrigation and Power District for a loan.

EMPLOYEES AND SALARIES OF FEDERAL FARM BOARD AND OTHER ORGANIZATIONS

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of a simple Senate resolution, which I send to the desk.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The resolution will be read for the information of the Senate.

The Chief Clerk read the resolution (S. Res. 358), as follows:

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Federal Farm Loan Board is requested to furnish the Senate, on or before March 1, 1933, with a report showing the total number of employees at the end of each fiscal year since its establishment, and on February 1, 1933, the aggregate salaries paid to employees of the board in the fiscal year ending June 30, 1933, and estimated to be paid to them in the current fiscal year and in the fiscal year 1933-34; the total number of employees of the Federal land banks on December 31, 1931, and February 1, 1933; the aggregate salaries paid in 1932 to employees, full or part time, of the Federal land banks; the total number of employees of the joint-stock land banks on December 31, 1931, and February 1, 1933; the aggregate salaries paid in 1932 to employees, full or part time, of the joint-stock land banks; the total number of employees of the intermediate-credit banks on December 31, 1931, and February 1, 1932; and the aggregate salaries paid in 1932 to employees, part or full time, of the intermediate credit banks.

Sec. 2. The secretary of the Federal Farm Board is requested to furnish the Senate, on or before March 1, 1933, with a report showing the total number of employees at the end of each fiscal year since its establishment, and on February 1, 1933; the aggregate salaries paid to employees of the board in the fiscal year ending June 30, 1932, and estimated to be paid to them in the current fiscal year, and in the fiscal year 1933-34; the total number of employees in the grain and cotton stabilization corporations and in any other corporations formed under the provisions of the agricultural marketing act of 1929, on December 31, 1931, and February 1, 1933; and the aggregate salaries paid by each of said corporations to its employees, part or full time, in 1932.

Sec. 3. The Secretary of Agriculture is requested to furnish the Senate, on or before March 1, 1933, with a report showing the total number of employees on January 1, 1933, and on February 15, 1933, in the seed-loan office; the aggregate salaries paid to employees of the seed-loan office in the fiscal year ending June 30, 1932, and estimated to be paid to them in the current fiscal year, and in the fiscal year 1933-34; the total number of employees in the crop-production loan office on January 1, 1933, and on February 15, 1933; the aggregate salaries paid to employees of the crop-production loan office in the fiscal year ending June 30, 1932, and estimated to be paid to them in the current fiscal year, and in the fiscal year 1933-34; the total number of employees in the agricultural credit corporations and in any other corporations set up under the Reconstruction Finance Corporation act of 1932, as amended, on January 1, 1933, and on February 15, 1933; and the aggregate salaries paid to employees of said corporation or said corporations in 1932 and estimated to be paid to them in 1933.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Minnesota asks unanimous consent for the present consideration of the resolution. Is there objection?

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, may I ask what date is fixed for the submission of the information requested?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. March 1, 1933.

Mr. McNARY. I think, personally, the information sought might be very useful to the Senate and to the House of Representatives in the formation of legislation in the future, but I doubt very much whether it can be furnished by the 1st day of March. I think it would be futile to attempt to get it by that date, and I suggest to the Senator that he extend the time to April the first.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. Very well, I accept the amendment. I suggest that the words "or as soon thereafter as possible" be inserted instead of April 1. I think that would be better.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair understands the Senator from Minnesota to amend his resolution in each place where the date March 1, 1933, appears by adding the words "or as soon thereafter as possible."

Mr. DILL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Minnesota yield for a question?

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. I yield.

Mr. DILL. The Senator asks for the total sums paid as salaries?

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. Yes.

Mr. DILL. I think it would be valuable information, in that connection, if we could get a statement of the positions, and the persons filling them, paying more than \$3,000 a year. I am informed that there are some unnecessarily high salaries paid in a number of these agricultural organizations, and I wish the Senator would submit an amendment providing that the names of the positions and the persons holding the positions where the salary is more than \$3,000 a year should be stated.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. I have no objection to that amendment, provided it will not jeopardize the passage of the resolution.

Mr. DILL. I think that is information we should have, because I note that the reports indicate that some of the officials and employees of these agricultural organizations are receiving what seems to be unconscionably high pay at this time. I offer an amendment to the resolution to insert at the end of the resolution the words "the names of the positions and the officials holding them where the pay is more than \$3,000 a year."

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. May the Chair suggest that the resolution is drawn in such a form that the amendment, in the manner in which the Senator from Washington proposes it, would require practically a complete rewriting of several of the paragraphs?

Mr. DILL. I think not.

Mr. McNARY. Let me suggest to the Senator that he confer with the Senator from Minnesota, and that the resolution be withheld for the present.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. Very well; let it go over under the rule.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair understands the Senator from Minnesota to request that the resolution go over for the present. That order will be entered.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD's resolution, as modified (S. Res. 358), is as follows:

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Federal Farm Loan Board is requested to furnish the Senate, on or before March 1, or as soon thereafter as possible, but not later than March 15, 1933, with a report showing the total number of employees at the end of each fiscal year since its establishment and on February 1, 1933; the aggregate salaries paid to employees of the board in the fiscal year ending June 30, 1932, and estimated to be paid to them in the current fiscal year and in the fiscal year 1933-34; the total number of employees of the Federal land banks on December 31, 1931, and February 1, 1933; the aggregate salaries paid in 1932 to employees, full or part time, of the Federal land banks; the total number of employees of the joint-stock land banks on December 31, 1931, and February 1, 1933; the aggregate salaries paid in 1932 to employees, full or part time, of the joint-stock land banks; the total number of employees of the intermediate-credit banks on December 31, 1931, and February 1, 1932; and the aggregate salaries paid in 1932 to employees, part or full time, of the intermediate-credit banks; and the positions and names of the employees receiving more than \$2,000 per year on February 15, 1933.

Sec. 2. The secretary of the Federal Farm Board is requested to furnish the Senate, on or before March 1, or as soon thereafter as possible, but not later than March 15, 1933, with a report showing the total number of employees at the end of each fiscal year since its establishment, and on February 1, 1933; the aggregate salaries paid to employees of the board in the fiscal year ending June 30, 1932, and estimated to be paid to them in the current fiscal year, and in the fiscal year 1933-34; the total number of employees in the grain and cotton stabilization corporations, and in any other corporations formed under the provisions of the agricultural marketing act of 1929, on December 31, 1931, and February 1, 1933; and the aggregate salaries paid by each of said corporations to its employees, part or full time in 1932, and the positions and the names of the employees receiving more than \$2,000 per year on February 15, 1933.

Sec. 3. The Secretary of Agriculture is requested to furnish the Senate, on or before March 1, or as soon thereafter as possible, but not later than March 15, 1933, with a report showing the total number of employees on January 1, 1933, and on February 15, 1933, in the seed loan office; the aggregate salaries paid to employees of the seed loan office in the fiscal year ending June 30, 1932, and estimated to be paid to them in the current fiscal year, and in the fiscal year 1933-34; the total number of employees in the crop production loan office on January 1, 1933, and on February 15, 1933; the aggregate salaries paid to employees of the crop production loan office in the fiscal year ending June 30, 1932, and estimated to be paid to them in the current fiscal year and in the fiscal year 1933-34; the total number of employees in the agricultural credit corporations, and in any other corporations set up under the Reconstruction Finance Corporation act of 1932, as amended, on January 1, 1933, and on February 15, 1933; and the aggregate salaries paid to employees of said corporation or said corporations in 1932, and estimated to be paid to them in 1933, and the positions and the names of the employees receiving more than \$2,000 per year on February 15, 1933.

CLARENCE R. KILLION

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the amendments of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 2148) for the relief of Clarence R. Killion, which were, on page 1, line 8, to strike out "honorably discharged" and insert "discharged under honorable conditions," and on page 1, line 10, after "no," to strike out the balance of the paragraph and insert "bounty, back pay, pension, allowance, or any payment provided under the World War veterans' act, 1924, as amended, the World War adjusted compensation act, 1924, as amended, or other benefit whatsoever to which said person may be or become entitled to by law, shall be held to have accrued prior to the passage of this act."

Mr. REED. I move that the Senate disagree to the amendments of the House, ask for a conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the President pro tempore appointed Mr. REED, Mr. CUTTING, and Mr. FLETCHER conferees on the part of the Senate.

AMENDMENT OF RADIO ACT OF 1927

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the action of the House of Representatives disagreeing to the

amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 7716) to amend the radio act of 1927, approved February 23, 1927, as amended (U. S. C., Supp. V, title 47, ch. 4), and for other purposes, and requesting a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon.

Mr. COUZENS. I move that the Senate insist on its amendments, agree to the conference asked by the House, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the President pro tempore appointed Mr. COUZENS, Mr. WATSON, Mr. FESS, Mr. SMITH, and Mr. DILL conferees on the part of the Senate.

A CENTURY OF PROGRESS—CHICAGO WORLD'S FAIR

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair lays before the Senate a joint resolution from the House of Representatives.

The joint resolution (H. J. Res. 561) amending section 2 of the joint resolution entitled "Joint resolution authorizing the President, under certain conditions, to invite the participation of other nations in the Chicago World's Fair, providing for the admission of their exhibits, and for other purposes," approved February 5, 1929, and amending section 7 of the act entitled "An act to protect the copyrights and patents of foreign exhibitors at A Century of Progress (Chicago World's Fair Centennial Celebration), to be held at Chicago, Ill., in 1933," approved July 19, 1932, was read twice by its title.

Mr. LEWIS. Mr. President, at the request of the Senator from Utah [Mr. Smoot], speaking for his committee, I yield to his suggestion in moving to have this joint resolution sent to the Committee on Finance.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The joint resolution will be referred to the Committee on Finance.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Latta, one of his secretaries.

FARMERS' HOLIDAY AND FARMERS' MORTGAGES

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, I ask leave to have published in the RECORD an address by Hon. HENRIK SHIPSTEAD, of Minnesota, over the National Broadcasting System, on February 11, 1933, given under the auspices of the League for Industrial Democracy, on the subject of "Farmers' Holiday and Farmers' Mortgages."

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, and it is as follows:

The so-called farmers' holiday which is spreading in the West means the farmer is declaring a holiday on foreclosures of mortgages and tax sales. They want a holiday in these matters because they have not the money to pay interest on mortgages nor the money to pay taxes. Court orders and sheriffs' sales are more and more frustrated by direct action of the farmers. The farmer is fighting for his home. He believes that his home is threatened as a result largely of policies that have been pursued by his National and local governments. He knows that even during the years of paper prosperity from 1920 to 1930 his income gradually declined until it totaled an annual loss of 50 per cent. He also knows that during the same period of time, when his income was disappearing until he had only one-half of the income that he had in 1923, industry was permitted to pursue policies that gave it an increase in income of 72 per cent. During that period of time the price of his products gradually declined and the price for the things he had to buy gradually increased. On his back were placed inflated bond issues of railroads as reflected in high freight rates, inflated industrial capitalization as reflected in watered stock, stock dividends, and monopoly prices wherever he had to buy. Industry and finance took so much out of the farmer in that period that they "killed the goose that laid the golden egg," and now both industry and finance are suffering and unemployment increasing. The farmer feels that he has had no part and no authority in formulating and executing these policies. He feels that he has had to pay for the mistakes of his business and political leaders, and now, through foreclosure sale and court orders, he believes that he is expected to pay for some more mistakes of these leaders by giving up his home, and that is a price he will not pay without protest. He is therefore joining with his neighbors to protect his home and theirs from what he considers confiscation of his home under the guise of law.

Leaders in finance and government have made the farmer pay for so many of their mistakes they seem to think he will pay some more. But the farmer is at the end of his rope. He refuses to continue to pay. He is now determined to have a showdown. He refuses to carry all the burdens of the world on his shoulders and he paid by losing his home. He is losing faith in

the integrity of political leaders and parties. He is beginning to believe that political party organizations are a form of racketeering to get the faithful party workers on the Government pay roll. He no longer accepts on faith the doctrine that his party is infallible and can do no wrong. He is beginning to see that is another slogan to keep him quiet so his pockets can be robbed. He has been pinched so hard he is beginning to wake up and look around. If he stays awake, good-by party politics and party slaves in high office. He will demand men who serve the Nation rather than the party and those who control it by controlling its leaders and its press. The farmer believes that what his newspapers call the country's "best minds" have been best only in concocting policies that are wrecking agriculture, commerce, our financial system, and causing unemployment of labor. The farmer is always conservative. He has accepted the leadership of the "best minds" because the newspapers have told him they represented economic soundness. He now discovers this is all a gigantic swindle either by design or stupidity. He is beginning to believe that instead of representing safety and security these "best minds" represent the most destructive forces in this country since its birth. He is not sure whether they are destructive through malice or ignorance and does not care. He demands security—something for his labor and the right to keep his home. He will pay his debts if given a chance.

The farmer is the victim of economic forces which he may not have understood and which were not within his control. But, when it is a matter of losing his home, he is confronted with a problem that he understands as clearly as the Massachusetts farmers did when at Lexington and Concord they are recorded in history as "the embattled farmers who stood and fired the shot heard round the world."

That is the spirit in which America was born, and that is the spirit that will permit America to live. Creditors are beginning to take notice of that spirit, because they have to some extent given public notice they are going to stop foreclosures for the time being, and in the meantime efforts are being made at Washington to provide for a moratorium and a refinancing of farm mortgages at a lower rate of interest. Congress has failed to anticipate present conditions and in the last three years has been concerned with administering palliatives, like the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, the home-loan banks, crop-production loans, and seed loans, etc. This is not getting rid of debt, it is merely increasing debt and the burdens on the back of the farmer and other debtors. He has other burdens besides his mortgage. These are too numerous to mention here in detail, but I can mention high freight rates levied to pay interest on railroad bond issues piled one upon the other for 50 years without provision for amortization. The inequality of the farmer's dollar as compared with the dollar of industry must be eliminated. The farmer buys in a protected market and sells in an unprotected market. He has to sell cheap and buy dear. He borrowed a cheap dollar and is expected to pay in a dear dollar.

The wages of capital like telephone rates, gas, electric lights, freight rates, price of farm machinery, have not come down. These are fixed charges that consumers are expected to pay. To preserve the integrity of bonds and stocks and mortgages the producer is being pauperized. The farmer of the West says he will fight before they shall take his home.

To-day I desire to speak to you particularly about the necessity of reducing the interest rate on his mortgages in order that the present avalanche of foreclosures shall be stopped and that the mortgages can be paid.

You people in the cities who are listening to me may not think that the plight of the farmer and his mortgage is any concern of yours. But you had better begin thinking about the farmers' plight, because his plight is now yours. His mortgages are in your savings banks and your life insurance companies to protect your savings. If the farm mortgages go to default and become worthless, your savings bank accounts and your life insurance policies will become worthless, too.

As I think over this complicated question, I see the paramount necessity of getting interest rates down at all costs, for all the Nation. I am convinced that a sound and lasting public policy can be worked out to provide for low interest rates at the same time that quickened and stimulated industry leads to a gradual reabsorption of the unemployed, and a gradual rise in commodity prices, and a gradual increase in the volume of traffic and trade. I am convinced that the key log in the jam will continue to be the farm-credit situation until we provide some comprehensive scheme for lowering rates on such a scale as will be calculated to fix the standard interest rates of the country for at least 8 or 10 years. And we will need that long to repair the damage and recover equilibrium.

We must get through this operation soon. Time is important in this matter. We must act quickly. Delay is fatal. It will not do, in my opinion, to start some elaborate process of revaluation. We have no William the Conqueror to ordain the preparation of a doomsday book, in which would be the revaluation of all land, farm or city, and all improvements thereon. Theoretically I accept the idea of revaluation of the capital structure of the Nation, but practically I find it quite impossible. There is now no foundation upon which to base values. No basis for valuation exists. We must stop liquidation and foreclosures at once and anticipate a return of values. I am prepared to take mortgages at their face value, and provide so low a rate of compensation upon the security we give for them as to reduce carrying charges by at least one-half. By so doing we preserve capital and savings at expense of income. By doing so I believe that we will

achieve much more than merely to solve the farm problem, serious and indispensable as this is. We hold down interest rates generally and contribute to make recovery possible upon a basis that does not involve too much mortgaging of future income for the Nation as a whole. We will loosen up billions of dollars of frozen assets. Writing down capital sums and letting interest take care of itself would probably lead to a scramble for funds and a very high interest rate. Holding down the interest rate, but leaving the capital unimpaired, would have the effect of freeing funds for industry without asking the farmer to carry a loan which in a few years might again paralyze his efforts.

These mortgages are in large part in savings banks and life-insurance companies where liabilities are held against them. If you write off their face value at 50 per cent, what becomes of your life insurance and savings in savings banks? If you preserve savings at face value at expense of income by giving a 50-year 2 per cent bond in exchange for a 6 per cent mortgage, you preserve the people's savings, restore confidence, and stop foreclosures and liquidation.

For the protection of life-insurance policies, savings-bank deposits, and to relieve the farmer of an interest burden that he can not pay and stay on the farm, I have introduced S. 5562. This bill is now before the Subcommittee of the Senate Banking and Currency Committee. Hearings have been held. This bill provides that the seven agencies created by the Federal Government loaning money to farmers shall be consolidated into one agency. This will eliminate duplication of administration, and, therefore, expense. Provision is made for the rewriting of farm mortgages to draw interest at $2\frac{1}{4}$ per cent a year. A rate of $1\frac{1}{4}$ per cent will be added for the purpose of paying off the principal of the loan. This small annual charge will pay off the mortgage in $46\frac{1}{2}$ years. Two and a quarter per cent interest and $1\frac{1}{4}$ per cent payment on the principal makes a total charge of $3\frac{1}{2}$ per cent a year. Thus the carrying charge to the farmer of his mortgage is reduced by 50 per cent. He now pays 6 per cent or more.

For the creditor the bill endeavors to save his capital at the expense of income. He sacrifices part of his income to save the face of his mortgage. Instead of getting 6 per cent he will get 2 per cent. Under the provisions of the bill he can exchange his mortgage for a 2 per cent Government bond due in 50 years. The Government agency will take in exchange for this bond the mortgage on the farm. This Government agency will then write a new mortgage under the terms I have previously outlined. This mortgage, as I said, will draw $2\frac{1}{4}$ per cent interest. The 2 per cent interest that the farmer pays will pay the interest on the Government bond. The one-fourth of 1 per cent interest will pay the cost of administration. The money already appropriated for these various agencies already loaning money will be withdrawn and what is needed will be appropriated for this new agency. Under this arrangement very little and possibly no new money will have to be appropriated. The Government merely lends its credit to give security and stability and a low rate of interest on farm mortgages. The carrying charge is so low it is expected the farmer can easily pay all costs involved and stay on the farm.

I expect that if this bill passes, liquidation of farm mortgages will cease; foreclosures will cease. The smashing of farm values will stop. Confidence will be restored, and billions of dollars of frozen credit will be loosened up. Time is important in this matter. Congress has for years delayed facing this issue. The descending avalanche of falling prices must be stopped. A depression is like an avalanche. If you are going to stop it you must have the speed and courage to get in front of the avalanche. You can not sit on the hind end of it and ride along with it. That is what we have been doing, and if we continue these policies the bottom is zero. Temporary measures and economic shots in the arm have only postponed the day of reckoning and aggravated the situation. Heroic action for a permanent policy of the kind outlined is now needed, and I hope this bill will have the support of the American people without regard to party politics. The number of the bill is S. 5562.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE—ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

A message from the House of Representatives by Mr. Haltigan, one of its clerks, announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills, and they were thereupon signed by the Vice President:

S. 188. An act for the relief of Tampico Marine Iron Works;

S. 222. An act authorizing adjustment of the claim of B. F. Hart;

S. 1586. An act for the relief of the estate of Peter Paul Franzel, deceased;

S. 4339. An act repealing certain provisions of the act of June 21, 1906, as amended, relating to the sale and encumbrance of lands of Kickapoo and affiliated Indians of Oklahoma; and

H. R. 11461. An act for the relief of C. N. Hildreth, jr.

VAN CAMP SEA FOOD CO. (INC.)

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 220) authorizing adjustment of the claim of the Van Camp Sea

Food Co. (Inc.), which was, on page 2, line 7, after "claim," to insert " : *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 per cent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or agents, attorney or attorneys, on account of services rendered in connection with said claim. It shall be unlawful for any agent or agents, attorney or attorneys, to exact, collect, withhold, or receive any sum of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 per cent thereof on account of services rendered in connection with said claim, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000."

Mr. WHITE. I move that the Senate concur in the amendment of the House.

The motion was agreed to.

LINDLEY NURSERIES (INC.)

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 3438) authorizing adjustment of the claim of Lindley Nurseries (Inc.), which was, on page 2, line 3, after "claim," to insert " : *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 per cent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or agents, attorney or attorneys, on account of services rendered in connection with said claim. It shall be unlawful for any agent or agents, attorney or attorneys, to exact, collect, withhold, or receive any sum of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 per cent thereof on account of services rendered in connection with said claim, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000."

Mr. WHITE. I move that the Senate concur in the amendment of the House.

The motion was agreed to.

WAR DEPARTMENT APPROPRIATIONS

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 14199) making appropriations for the military and nonmilitary activities of the War Department for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1934, and for other purposes.

Mr. COUZENS. Mr. President, I move that paragraph 4 of Rule XVI be suspended, according to the notice given on February 9, so that I may offer an amendment to House bill 14199 which is now lying on the desk.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the motion proposed by the senior Senator from Michigan [Mr. COUZENS].

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, I want to recall the Senate now to the matter immediately before it, namely, the motion of my colleague, the senior Senator from Michigan [Mr. COUZENS], to suspend the rules for the purpose of considering the amendment which he has submitted to the pending War Department appropriation bill, for the purpose of caring for the itinerant youth of the country which has been driven by economic necessity to take to the road.

It will be recalled that I was holding the floor at the time of the recess on Saturday evening, and that I was addressing myself to the analogy partially existing between citizens' military training camps and the concentrations of itinerant young men at Army posts as is contemplated by the plans submitted under the pending amendment.

Mr. President, I want to pursue that analogy for a few moments, because I think it is fundamentally essential to a correct viewpoint of the possibilities inherent in the prospectus which now invites the Senate's approval.

I want to say again, as a basis for these observations, that I am a profound believer in the reserve system of the national defense, and I am a great believer in the citizens' military training camps. It seems to me that they inevitably produce better citizens. It seems to me that the results in terms of soldiery, while important in themselves,

are utterly secondary to the results achieved in terms of citizenship and character, and that these are the more important crops that are raised from these seeds.

It occurs to me that there is unusual opportunity in the proposal submitted by my colleague to broaden the advantages which we seek through our annual appropriations for these citizens' military training camps, that there is an opportunity here to broaden the scope and to broaden the influence of these great factors in character building and patriotism and manhood to which I have adverted. How important it is that these assets should be capitalized by us in respect to this itinerant young manhood of America in its hour of distress and disaster and woe. It seems to me that the opportunity is as appealing as it is urgent.

The purpose of the citizens' camps in the final analysis, so far as I am concerned, has always been not to make warriors but to make citizens. It is in terms of that analogous purpose that I contemplate a great public utility in the proposition submitted by my colleague. Therefore, since it has this public utility, it is lifted out of the ordinary scheme of relief proposals and comes to us with a character analogous to the precise thing which we are undertaking to do in that other section of the bill which again sets up citizens' military training camps.

Mr. President, I repeat, so there may be no misunderstanding, that there is no intention to induct these boys into the actual military service, and that there is no intention to bind them with a military commitment. Nevertheless, the door is open to bring them under all of these secondary influences which I insist are the prime benefits of citizens' military training camps. The door is open and the warrant is written in the amendment itself in this aspect of the adventure. I want to invite attention again to the precise language of the amendment, on page 2, referring to these itinerant young men who are now without home, without subsistence, without opportunity in life, without a fair chance in the presence of this terrific catastrophe of the present moment. I want to invite attention to the fact that when these young men are gathered into these camps and these military posts they enter under the following rule, and I quote from the proposal:

Any person admitted to any military post pursuant to the provisions of paragraph 1 of this section shall, so far as practicable, be subject to the customary military discipline maintained at such post and shall participate in all forms of beneficial and healthful exercise.

Mr. COUZENS. Mr. President, will my colleague yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. DICKINSON in the chair). Does the Senator from Michigan yield to his colleague?

Mr. VANDENBERG. Certainly.

Mr. COUZENS. I want to modify the amendment before we vote on the question by adding, on page 2, at the end of line 10, after the word "exercise," the words "and vocational training so far as practicable with the available facilities," which I think will improve it.

Mr. VANDENBERG. The Senator adds one more exhibit to the bill of particulars respecting available resources that can be capitalized at the various posts for the benefit of this adventure.

The thing I was particularly emphasizing is the fact that beneficial and helpful exercise, using the language of the amendment, may properly include drills—may properly include the fundamentals which, I repeat, I find in these citizens' military training camps as being of prime advantage to the creation of citizenship and of fidelities of the Nation. These boys, in my conception of the thing which is proposed by my colleague, are invited analogously into the wholesome and useful atmosphere of citizens' military training camps.

Mr. President, I am very sure that if the Committee on Military Affairs of the Senate confronted a direct opportunity to expand the influences of citizens' military training camps to touch 90,000 additional young American lives it would be highly enthusiastic over the prospect. It would conceive that a contribution was about to be made not only to the fundamental defenses of the Nation but to the funda-

mental character of the United States. I submit that my colleague is proposing in net results precisely that thing.

The sympathetic use of the authority which is granted to the War Department and to the military post commanders who shall be over these concentrations of boys is bound to produce a régime which, while falling short of military training in the technical sense, can make better men and better citizens. At least it means subjection to discipline and order. These influences are of incalculable advantage to youth. Youth needs them in the process of molding dependable maturity. The citizenship of to-morrow is better and safer and wiser in proportion as these influences have been brought to bear in its development. It seems to me that these advantages to the Government and to organized society are inherent in the proposed program precisely as they are inherent in citizens' military training camps. I am speaking now solely of the public advantage adherent in the plan. I am not speaking at all as yet of our social responsibility to these itinerant young men. I shall advert to that in a moment.

But I submit that if public money spent upon building sound Americans in citizens' military training camps is justified, then so is public money spent under like auspices upon the emancipation of 90,000 itinerant American young men who to-day are at the mercy and disposition of utterly untoward and malignant influences as a result of the economic depression in which we find ourselves.

The boys about whom we are talking are not hoboes. This is a very important phase of the matter, because if we were simply proposing to deal with the well-known tramp the proposition would be of a totally different nature. That is not the type of young men who are involved in the problem which my colleague has brought to the bar of the Senate. We are not dealing with bums or hoboes in any sense of the word. The conclusive testimony available upon this subject is that by tens of thousands these boys are worth-while lads who are among the innocent victims of this economic debacle. Indeed, many of them have become nomads because they have so much character that they decline longer to burden their own distraught hearthstones with their unproductive presence. That is the type of young man whom it is proposed to save under this régime. Such a type is everlastingly worth while.

Now, let us be quite sure that that is so. I want to read briefly from page 92 of the Monthly Labor Review published by the United States Department of Labor for the month of January, 1933, an official Government document bearing the imprimatur of the Government:

Type of boys on the road.

This is the paragraph which I read, and it is the boys on the road for whom my colleague is stressing his amendment. What is the type of boy on the road? I quote:

There is much testimony that these boys, who come from practically every State in the Union, represent in the main substantial American families.

I repeat, not hoboes, not bums, not flotsam and jetsam, but the representatives of substantial American families.

High-school students are not uncommon among them, and the class of professional wanderers is not conspicuous. Social workers, police, and railroad men who are in constant touch with these boys assert their belief that the overwhelming majority of them are young men and boys who would normally be in school or at work, that they are on the road because there is nothing else to do, sometimes because sheer pride will not permit them to sit idle at home, sometimes because support for the whole family came from a relief agency and was highly inadequate properly to feed the younger children, that they are on the whole not of the habitual hobo or criminal type.

This is the testimony of an official Government source. Now let us look a little further into the type of boys on the road.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, before the Senator does that will he yield for a question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Michigan yield to the Senator from Pennsylvania?

Mr. VANDENBERG. Gladly.

Mr. REED. What is there in the proposed amendment that confines its application to these migratory young men? What is to prevent any farm hand in Mississippi, for instance, giving up his work and going to live in a Government training camp?

Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. President—

Mr. VANDENBERG. I should think the thing that would prevent it would be a sympathetic administration of the proposal as it is submitted. It speaks for itself in its own language. I yield to the Senator from California.

Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. President, I was about to invite the Senator's attention to the language of the amendment.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Yes; it speaks for itself in its own language. It applies to—

Any unmarried male person between the ages of 17 and 24, both inclusive, who is without means of support and who shall apply at any such Army post within one year after the date of the enactment of this act and give satisfactory evidence to the commanding officer thereof that he is unemployed at the time of application—

And so forth.

The persons admitted under the terms of the amendment as stated in the amendment thus fall under the complete discipline of the post. I suppose a literal translation of the language might qualify those of whom the Senator from Pennsylvania speaks.

Mr. BROOKHART. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. VANDENBERG. I yield.

Mr. BROOKHART. From my knowledge of the condition of the farm hands in Mississippi, and practically all the other States, I think that probably they could about all qualify as unemployed. They are practically unemployed, they are not getting enough for a decent living, and if we had enough Army posts I would be willing to take care of them all.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, I dislike to be de-toured into a discussion of the agricultural problem. If delimitation is necessary, in the language of the amendment, to determine more safely the boundaries to which it should be confined and to which obviously my colleague addresses his amendment, I am perfectly sure that there would be no objection to the limitation, because the objective is clear and obvious, and it is the precise objective which I have been discussing; it is the objective which has been described in all the addresses that have been made by my colleague the senior Senator from Michigan [Mr. COUZENS] upon this proposition. It is the boys upon the road, and it is particularly the character of the boys on the road which has challenged the interest that results in the introduction of the legislation; and I want to speak again about the character of the boys on the road.

I want to remind the Senate that out of a group of 1,140 boys who were contacted at Phoenix, Ariz., according to the testimony on page 178 of the hearings of the committee on the La Follette-Costigan bill—out of this group of 1,140 boys—22 had college training, 470 had high-school training, and 648 had training in the grade schools. That is not the hobo; that is not the bum or the tramp.

I want to read also from the same hearing, a sentence from Mr. Paul V. Robinson, superintendent of the Wayside Mission at Anderson, Ind., on page 164 of the testimony.

Mr. Robinson is speaking of a group of 400 transients, including about 27 per cent less than 25 years of age. I quote:

Regarding the type of men who are on the road, this survey reveals that the cream of our American manhood and young manhood are on the road at the present time.

I repeat, "the cream of American manhood and young manhood are on the road at the present time."

The more enterprising men and boys are on the road, and the more worthless stay at home and get local relief. Many boys leave home because that leaves more food at home for those who are at home.

Mr. President, the testimony available respecting the character of the boys who are on the road is the thing that primarily challenges my interest and my support for the

pending proposition. If the language of the resolution is too broad to create and identify and maintain priority for those particular boys, the language can be changed; but there is—

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator's time has expired on the amendment. He has 15 minutes on the bill.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I will speak on the bill. If amendments to the pending proposal are desirable, let them be offered and determined upon their merits. But let us not dismiss the whole contemplation simply because we challenge some detail. The objective which we are seeking to reach is perfectly plain, and everybody knows what it is. It is to reach the type of boys on the road concerning whom I have been speaking. They are not hoboes as yet; they are not bums as yet; they are not tramps as yet. It remains to be seen whether or not their classification must change under the pummellings of circumstance in the difficult days which lie about us.

The Senator from Pennsylvania asked me on Saturday when we were debating this phase of the problem what I would do with a thousand boys of this character at Fort Myer on a stormy, bitter Saturday afternoon. Well, we discussed what might be done with a thousand boys at Fort Myer.

I am wondering, Mr. President, however, whether the question as to what could be done with a thousand boys gathered together under such wholesome auspices on such a bitter day is not utterly secondary in the purview of our responsibility to the much larger question of what would become of that same thousand boys if they have no Fort Myer at which to concentrate, if they have no shelter under which to gather, if they have no even meager subsistence except the "break of luck" upon the road in the cruelties of a bitter, cold, snowy afternoon. Since we are dealing with a type of boy who is inherently the good citizen of to-morrow I think the question is not so much what the commander of the military post will ultimately do in developing his responsibility under the pending amendment, because I have ample confidence in the military genius and imagination in control of these camps amply to answer that question successfully. I think the question is what happens to the boys if they have not these places to which to go. It seems to me that that is a question in government and in sociology which can not be ignored, nor is it one that can be subordinated to the mere contemplation of how the mechanics of this scheme shall operate after we have asked a competent Army to take charge of the situation.

Mr. President, there was a further implication involved in the inquiry made by the Senator from Pennsylvania a few moments ago which I would not want to avoid. Among other implications to be drawn from it is the implication that in this proposal we are invading the realm of local responsibility for the relief of those who are in distress.

The Senator well knows my view upon that subject; it is entirely and completely his own view. I am a believer in the theory that the American system requires reliance upon home resources in the home communities to the point of exhaustion before there is any responsibility either upon the State governments or ultimately upon the Federal Government; and the Senator from Pennsylvania will find me constantly defending that viewpoint upon this floor, as he always has found me voting consistently with it. But this, Mr. President, it seems to me, is the precise exception that proves the rule. There is an interstate responsibility upon the Federal Government, always acknowledged; there is an interstate responsibility which is an inherent part of our constitutional theory of government, and I submit that this itinerant and roving army of young men, homeless young men, jobless young men, moving up and down the country to-day presents an interstate problem inevitably, and that there is no violence done to the fundamental theory of things to which both the Senator from Pennsylvania and I subscribe when we undertake in this instance to acknowledge our interstate responsibility and serve it under Federal auspices.

The question of the cost of the proposal has been argued against it at some length, and I want to speak briefly about the question of cost. It is very essential to get a correct perspective in regard to the cost, precisely as it was essential to get a correct perspective in regard to what should be done with those thousand boys at Fort Meyer. Of course, it is necessary to assess the cost in money, though there is another cost to be assessed which is far more important; but even the cost in money, Mr. President, I can not believe, will remotely approach the figures that were submitted originally by the War Department on the basis of a possible population of 300,000 in these Army concentration camps.

I call the attention of the Senate to the fact that in making its reply and in submitting its estimate the War Department, while figuring upon 300,000 boys, indicated that it is already equipped to care for about 90,000 boys with existing facilities. When the War Department made the assessment as to what this adventure would cost, it estimated the cost not only in terms of 90,000 boys for whom facilities already are available, but also in terms of 210,000 boys, for whom no facilities whatever are available. Therefore, Mr. President, when we eliminate the 210,000, for whom no facilities are available, and when we propose to confine the enterprise to those boys for whom facilities are available, we inevitably eliminate the element of major cost, because the element of major cost must have been that element which attaches to the care of boys for whom entirely new facilities would have to be created. So the figure found in the War Department estimate, to wit, \$109,000,000 for 300,000 boys, even when relatively broken down to \$33,000,000 pro rata to care for 90,000 boys, unquestionably will become a substantially smaller figure because of the differential to which I have adverted. The actual cost of the adventure inevitably, I submit, would be infinitely less than the figures which were submitted by the War Department.

Mr. DICKINSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Michigan yield to the Senator from Iowa?

Mr. VANDENBERG. I yield.

Mr. DICKINSON. If we limit the proposed legislation to boys for whom we have facilities, how can we bar the boys who are just on the outside of the group that can be cared for with existing facilities?

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, I should say that was a practical question which arises in respect to any undertaking upon which the Federal Government might embark in respect to its citizenship in times like these. I do not believe it is any argument against making the initial step with respect to a useful and sound experiment simply because it is impossible to embrace the entire field of service which might be prospectively involved. Neither do I think that there is any validity in the argument of the able Senator from Arkansas along the same line, as it was submitted on Saturday last to the Senate; namely, that the relief problem is so large that this particular contribution becomes, in turn, so small that it is scarcely worth while proceeding with it. I think it is worth while proceeding with any practical program which promises practical results. I do not subscribe to the "all or nothing" theory.

Now, I submit, Mr. President, as Exhibit A, that we face this particular problem, to wit, the boy on the road, and that it is essentially a Federal responsibility because it involves an interstate movement.

I submit as Exhibit B that it is practical to contemplate handling these boys as proposed by the pending amendment through the use of the unused military facilities of the Nation scattered up and down, North, East, South, and West, and available to all sections of the land.

I submit as Exhibit C that we have a right to believe, based upon what has happened in our citizens' military training camps, that the result of these contacts will be not only to relieve distress, not only to meet a difficult social problem, not only to answer an interstate responsibility which rests upon the Federal Government, but also to create better citizens in respect to those who are thus served.

So we are finally back again to the question of cost; and I submit that there is another and a larger cost problem than that which is involved in the mere mathematics submitted by the War Department in respect to the expenditures that would have to be made to implement this program. What would it cost not to do this thing; or, if this particular thing be not done, what will it cost except as we find some other and better alternative method in which to deal with the problem?

The larger cost problem is not the cost problem relating to doing the thing proposed by the amendment submitted by the senior Senator from Michigan. The major cost challenge is, What will it cost if we do not do it?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The time of the Senator from Michigan has expired.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator will state it.

Mr. VANDENBERG. With an amendment pending, and a motion pending, and the bill pending, am I entitled to speak 45 minutes?

The VICE PRESIDENT. There is no amendment pending. There is a motion pending. Under that, the Senator would not be entitled to speak 15 minutes more at this time.

Mr. GRAMMER. Mr. President, I rose to ask the Senator from Michigan a question.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Will the Senator from Michigan answer the question of the Senator from Washington?

Mr. VANDENBERG. If I can answer it in the Senator's time. I have no time of my own.

Mr. GRAMMER. I rose merely to ask this question:

On the question of cost, which the Senator so recently discussed, has he taken into consideration what the potential cost might be in case those young men are taken under the wing of the Army of the United States for protection; for instance, in case of accident during that time which might cost life or limb, or in case of disease, and so forth, which might be contracted during that time, which might partially or permanently disable the young man? Will he come under the pension laws, and must he be taken care of during life because of the fact that he happened to be a ward of the Government during this particular 12 months or so? Has that phase of the matter been taken into consideration? If so, I should like to have whatever information the Senator has regarding it.

Mr. VANDENBERG. With the Senator's permission, and intruding upon his time, I reply as follows, if I can remember the complete question:

In the first place, the amendment specifically excludes any enlistment in the Army or any relationship to the Army which would create a basis for any such subsequent claim as the Senator has in mind.

In respect to the cost of caring for the young man in the event of disease or accident, evidently the War Department has contemplated that factor, because in the schedule of prospective expense submitted by the able Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. REED] was included an item of \$18 per man per year for medical attention.

I think that covers the cost questions which the Senator affirmatively submitted; and, if he will be good enough to permit me to say in his time what I was precluded from saying at the conclusion of my remarks, I should like to say to him that the larger cost which we are inevitably confronting in respect to this army of itinerant, homeless boys is the cost that is involved in the broken characters of to-morrow's citizens; the cost that is involved in broken physical and moral resistance; the cost that is involved in accidents and deaths upon the road; and the cost that is involved in crimes to-day, to-morrow, and as long as this heritage persists.

Those may seem to be abstract things. They are unrelated to precise mathematics; but the Senator is a heartfelt man, and he knows that there is reality in those exhibits, and that they do represent terribly tangible costs in the final analysis. My judgment would be, if I may conclude

my answer to the Senator, that the balance sheet will show in the Government's favor if we undertake to meet this problem as my colleague has suggested.

Mr. GRAMMER. I thank the Senator for his explanation of the matter about which I asked.

However, it occurs to me that there has not been fully taken into consideration an obligation which without question will come to the front in case of accident—and there will be accidents—in case of fire and that kind of thing, or, in some cases, explosion. In those cases the Government of the United States will recognize and accept that responsibility and pay for it. My question was based upon that idea, as to how much the Senator figured that portion of the cost would amount to. The \$18 for medical attendance to which reference has been made, of course, would probably be sufficient to take care of the boarder, the young man, during the time he was actually receiving that assistance. Then, when the time comes that he must leave the protection of the Army, is that to be based upon the time limit that the hammer falls that day, and he must go out in the world without a job and with a condition prevailing that is not any better, or perchance even worse, than at the time when he entered the institution?

Mr. BROOKHART. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Washington yield to the Senator from Iowa?

Mr. GRAMMER. In just a moment.

There is another point which I should like to mention, and that is the qualifications for a young man to enter one of these training camps. He must be six months without employment—six months without employment. Perhaps a man has been without employment for several months, and he thinks, "Well, I am not going to take this job because I can go over to the military training camp if I remain idle for a little bit longer."

Senators, this legislation may be all right. I am not saying whether it is or not. There are young men who will not participate even though they qualify. Others will court participation, and they will partake of it as long as it is possible for them to do it, and they will mangle in every way to try to continue it as long as it is possible for them to do so. The question in my mind is whether or not it is possible for us to formulate laws that will cause men—some men, young men—to decide that they will start out with their own initiative, and try to make a living in this country for themselves, rather than throw themselves utterly upon the taxpaying people of the country for support.

We are talking about questions before this Congress that were not recognized a few decades ago. Questions are coming up here that are of such a socialistic nature that they would have surprised the Congress of the United States a few years ago.

I am not classifying this bill as purely socialistic; but, Senators, it is taking quite a step along that line. Our present form of government is not a socialistic government. Our present form of government is not a paternalistic government. If we are going to keep taking these steps within the socialistic field, ultimately it will be necessary for us to change entirely our form of government, and have a socialistic government with which these measures may square. They do not fit in our present form of government.

FIVE PER CENT CUT IN DEPARTMENTAL EXPENDITURES

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. Mr. President, a few days ago the Senate passed the Treasury-Post Office appropriation bill, which is in conference. I intend to discuss the situation that now presents itself to the Senate and to the country as a result of the so-called Bratton amendment contained in that bill as it left the Senate.

Because of its importance, I am taking the liberty to use 15 minutes of time that ordinarily should be given to debate on the pending question. I shall not discuss that any more than to say that I am in sympathy with the purposes of the amendment and with what the distinguished Senator from Michigan [Mr. COUZENS] hopes to accomplish by the camps for boys.

Mr. President, perhaps it is a little late to discuss the so-called Bratton amendment and the general 5 per cent cut. Ordinarily I should think it would be; but the situation here is unique. It develops now that this amendment—this 5 per cent general cut—would practically annihilate the American Navy and reduce it to one of third-class power. Because of that fact, it is very important that all the facts be taken into consideration by the conferees in the conference between the two Houses to the end that the Bratton amendment may be eliminated from the bill before it is sent to the White House for signature.

Mr. President, I think much of the evil of that general 5 per cent cut has been brought to our attention through the medium of a letter written by my very able friend the senior Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BINGHAM] to the Secretary of the Navy, which elicited from the Navy Department a response which tells the story very eloquently and in a few words. With the consent of the Senator from Connecticut, I would like to have that letter incorporated in the RECORD, unless indeed the Senator from Connecticut may have some objection to such procedure, or unless he desires to have it incorporated himself.

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. GRAMMER in the chair). Does the Senator from Indiana yield to the Senator from Connecticut?

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. I yield.

Mr. BINGHAM. The so-called Bratton amendment was not brought to the attention of the Economy Committee during our rather prolonged study of various measures of economy. Nor was it presented to the Committee on Appropriations when we had under consideration that part of the Treasury-Post Office bill which deals with amendments to the economy act.

As a conferee on the part of the Senate, of course, it is my duty to support whatever action the Senate took. In order to secure facts in regard to the effect of different parts of the bill, I have been endeavoring to post myself, and on February 9 I wrote to the heads of the various departments, among them to the Secretary of the Navy, this letter:

FEBRUARY 9, 1933.

The Senate has adopted the so-called Bratton-Costigan amendments to the Treasury and Post Office appropriation bill requiring the heads of departments to cut at least 5 per cent from the amount allowed them by their annual appropriation bills.

So many claims have been circulated regarding the impossibility of carrying out the Senate amendments without serious consequences, I am anxious to know what will be the effect on your department and the manner in which it will be possible to carry out the wishes of the Senate.

As a member of the conference on behalf of the Senate, I need this information in order to be able to explain to the House conferees the effect of the proposed amendments.

Sincerely yours,

HIRAM BINGHAM.

Mr. President, had the amendments been suggested to the Economy Committee before we concluded our recommendations to the Committee on Appropriations, we should have endeavored to secure from each department a statement of the probable effect on that department of the proposed 5 per cent cut. That was not done, and since I was appointed a Senate conferee, I felt that it was necessary to find out exactly what the results might be, so that there might not be any rumors in conference as to what the effect would be, and in order that the conferees might have the facts before them. Therefore I asked the departments for their views, as I have said in this letter, and in reply to the letter I have received a number of communications, all of which have been printed in a memorandum for the use of the conferees. Therefore I have no objection whatever to the Senator from Indiana referring to the letter, or using it in any way he sees fit to, since it was an effort on the part of the chairman of the Economy Committee to secure exact information for the use of himself and other conferees in presenting the case to the House.

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. Mr. President, that being the case, I take this opportunity to read the letter addressed to the Senator from the Secretary of the Navy, which in very

concise form gives figures which I think the country ought to have at this time, and certainly figures which should be brought forcibly to the attention of the conferees of the two Houses when they confer on the particular measure now pending before them.

The letter is dated February 10 and reads:

The Navy budget, now in the hands of the Appropriations Committee of the House, provides \$308,669,562 direct appropriations. To make a 5 per cent cut with the least possible disaster, the Navy would be obliged—

1. To keep the fleet on the west coast; close certain east coast navy yards; slow down the work on ships now building and modernizing, at great loss of time and increase of cost. This would necessitate the discharge of about 4,500 civilians, and would save approximately \$7,500,000.

2. Restrict reserve activities, at a cut of about \$1,500,000; stop now further regular Navy enlistments, reducing Navy enlisted personnel by 9,000 men by the end of the fiscal year 1934, resulting in a cut of approximately \$5,000,000. This would result in putting out of active commission additional ships, as shown by column 2 in the following table, which refers only to combatant troops:

Total number ships in class	Number additional to be placed out of active commission	Ships already out of commission	Total to be kept out of active commission
15 battleships.....	3	2	5
4 aircraft carriers ¹	2	0	2
15 heavy cruisers ²	4	2	6
10 light cruisers.....	2	2	4
103 destroyers.....	13	31	44
54 submarines.....	6	12	18
4 light mine layers.....	2	0	2
2 dirigibles ³	1	0	1
	33	49	82

¹ Includes 1 under construction.

² Includes 1 under construction.

³ Includes 6 under construction.

This leaves in full commission about 66 per cent of the number of British and 56 per cent of the number of Japanese ships which are in full commission, or fully manned.

3. Reduce Marine Corps by about 1,150 men, resulting in a cut of about \$1,000,000.

Our Navy is already 20,000 men short of the number necessary properly to man our ships in commission.

It is evident that this further cut of 10,150 enlisted men would cripple our national defense for years, seriously injure the morale of the service, and, taken together with the discharge of 4,500 civil employees, result in an increase of 14,650 unemployed.

Sincerely,

C. F. ADAMS.

Mr. President, that would bring about a most deplorable situation, of course. It would simply make us a third-class power. We would be 66 per cent as strong as Great Britain on the sea, and 56 per cent as strong as Japan, though we are supposed to sustain the ratio with the latter power as 5 to 3.

I am sure the Senate must never have comprehended just how far this 5 per cent general cut would take us. The situation in the world to-day is chaotic in the extreme. One never knows what a day may bring forth, and that is particularly true on the Pacific and in the Far East. We have an empire out there to safeguard, the Philippines, for instance, during the next 10 to 14 years, in any event. We have Guam, and American Samoa, and the Hawaiian Islands, to say nothing of Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands in the Atlantic, with the Panama Canal Zone, and the canal itself; and, at a time like this, utterly to emasculate the Navy it seems to me would be unthinkable.

Then there is the additional fact that, instead of alleviating unemployment in the slightest degree, this 5 per cent general cut would increase unemployment all along the line. In the Navy Department alone it would increase unemployment to the extent of 14,650 persons. I submit that is not sane economy; it is economy gone wild. It seems to me that the conferees should give these facts, recently come to light, the most serious attention.

Mr. President, of course we do not desire war with any other nation. We have never desired war with any other land. Yet in the course of our history we have been engaged in 6 major conflicts, and I take it that in the next 150 years, unless human nature changes completely, we

may be engaged in 6 additional major conflicts, whether we like it or not. So we must be prepared for emergencies, and especially in times like these; not for aggressive warfare, of course, since no nation has anything we desire. All we wish is to be let alone. But we must be able to defend ourselves and our institutions and our sovereignty if attacked from without, and this 5 per cent general cut would make it impossible for the United States of America to be able actually to defend herself in case of trouble with any other nation in the world.

Mr. President, I was impressed this morning by a statement in the Washington Herald attributed to my very distinguished friend, the senior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. REED], which upon inquiry he confirms, and I will read the statement. The Senator from Pennsylvania said:

While America has no hostile designs against any nation, I am afraid that is not true of the feeling of other nations toward us. So this cut may have grave consequences.

I submit that the Senator from Pennsylvania states the fact succinctly and in few words. We have nothing against any other nation, but from all the indications we can get, from the press and otherwise, other nations are not so amicably inclined toward us. Therefore we must look after our own interests.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's time on the motion has expired. He has 15 minutes on the bill.

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. Mr. President, before I resume my seat I want to quote from another letter addressed to the senior Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BINGHAM]. That Senator is not here, but I assume it will be satisfactory to him for me to read excerpts from this letter. It is signed by the Secretary of War, and refers to the same 5 per cent cut about which I have been speaking. I quote from the first paragraph of the letter the following:

However, to anyone cognizant of the extent to which our preparations for national defense have been emasculated during the past two years the calamitous import of this undirected compulsory attrition is unescapable.

Again, the last paragraph of Mr. Hurley's letter is as follows:

A further arbitrary cut of 5 per cent is now proposed after everything loose in the Military Establishment has been thrown overboard. Only a few items are left to which such a cut could be applied without creating deficiencies, and these are of such vital importance to the military structure on which our system of national defense rests that successive reviewing authorities have preserved them despite the admitted necessity for cutting public expenditures to the bone. To destroy them at this time, when the larger nations are increasing their outlays for military preparedness, is to expose the Nation unjustifiably to the most serious of consequences.

That is signed by Patrick J. Hurley, Secretary of War.

Mr. President, I note a quotation this morning also from General MacArthur, which I read as follows:

We are already below the danger line in trained personnel—the most vital factor in the Army. We are short in everything—clothing, motors, horses. We'll be short of food if we aren't careful. We may be forced to go on depression rations for the Army.

I submit, Mr. President, that that suggests a grave situation which will ensue if this additional cut of 5 per cent should go into effect.

Consequently, I have taken these few minutes to try, if I may, to impress upon the Senate and the conferees, both of the Senate and of the House, the real gravity of the situation, trusting that they may agree to eliminate this general cut of 5 per cent.

There are additional reasons why it should be eliminated.

Mr. FESS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Indiana yield to the Senator from Ohio?

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. I yield.

Mr. FESS. I suppose the Senator's mail, like mine and probably like that of other Senators, brings many letters relating to this subject matter. Every citizen of the country, realizing how much we are running behind, is becoming almost hysterical about our inability to balance the Budget by avoiding any taxation and by merely reducing expenses. How does the Senator get the information to the average

citizen in Indiana that we can not possibly reach what he wants done by merely cutting the expenses?

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. All any Member of the Senate can do, so far as his constituents are concerned, with reference to any question they propound, is to give them the facts, the actual facts, and show them that under the situation at present obtaining it is impossible to balance the Budget by so-called economy measures. Other methods must be resorted to.

Mr. FESS. The average citizen is under the impression that it can be done by our dismissing or cutting the salaries of employees to the point he asks. I had several letters this morning inquiring, "Why keep loafers on the pay roll?" What does the Senator do in reply to a letter of that sort?

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. I would ask them to point out the loafers. I would not hesitate to ask them to do so. So far as my own knowledge goes, I could not agree that that is true. The Senator from Ohio doubtless would feel the same way about it. If he does, the only thing the Senator can say to his constituents is that it is not true and state the facts to his constituents, and trust and hope that they will understand the real situation.

Mr. FESS. Mr. President, will the Senator permit another question?

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. Certainly.

Mr. FESS. A Senator recently introduced a resolution to keep our appropriations within our income. Information of the introduction of that resolution was widely circulated all over the country. I am constantly being asked why the Government does not do what any other substantial business concern would do and that it is to cut our expenses in accordance with our income and not go beyond our income.

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. It seems to me the Senator should simply state the facts to his constituents, namely, that to keep up an adequate national defense in this country costs approximately \$1,000,000,000, without waste; that to take care of the bonded indebtedness and interest and sinking fund requires more than \$1,000,000,000 annually; and that it takes approximately \$1,000,000,000 to take care of the disabled veterans of the various wars and their dependents, and that leaves only about \$750,000,000 or \$800,000,000 with which to pay the overhead, operating expenses of the Government. Consequently the Government is being economically managed at the present time, and it is impossible to take 25 per cent off of that figure, as everybody knew and as Mr. Roosevelt must have known at the time the suggestion was made, without putting the Government out of business entirely. It seems to me if the Senator would say that to his constituents he would but state the facts and that would end it.

Mr. FESS. If the Senator will permit me further, I dictated a letter this morning stating that the interest on the public debt and sinking fund amounts to about \$1,250,000,000; that the services to the veterans amount to very nearly \$1,000,000,000. I put the figure at \$928,000,000. I said that the War Department and Navy Department appropriations would be less than \$700,000,000, although we are cutting \$106,000,000 out of the War Department appropriation bill, leaving about \$648,000,000 to care for all proper expenses of administration, and that we would have to take the cuts about which we are talking out of the \$648,000,000, unless we change our whole policy in regard to contracts.

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. A cut of 25 per cent would take out the entire \$648,000,000.

Mr. FESS. I wondered how the Senator deals with these complaints. They are sincere and honest, but the whole country is suffering under a misapprehension.

Mr. REED. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Indiana yield to the Senator from Pennsylvania?

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. Certainly.

Mr. REED. It seems to me the country has not been sufficiently told of the economies which have been made. We have reduced the Department of Agriculture appropriations \$200,000,000 this year under last year. Last year we appropriated for that department \$300,000,000, and this year we

are appropriating only \$100,000,000. The country does not know that. Last year there was a reduction as against the preceding year.

In the War Department appropriation bill pending to-day we are appropriating \$106,000,000 less than last year. The country does not know that. They think that the Army costs about \$500,000,000 and the Navy costs about \$500,000,000, but that is not so. The military activities of the War Department actually total approximately \$276,000,000, a very great reduction under what it used to be. The country does not know it. All we can do is to tell the people the facts.

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. I agree with the Senator and am very grateful to him for his contribution to the discussion.

Mr. President, I assume that my time has about expired, but I wish to mention one other feature of the 5 per cent general cut, and that is that it would take away from the Veterans' Administration \$47,000,000. So far as our hospital and hospitalization program for the disabled veterans is concerned, that would be a tragedy. It is impossible to bring about a cut of that extent without doing a grave injustice to the disabled veterans.

Finally, and because the facts are stated so well and so succinctly, I ask in connection with my remarks that an editorial appearing in the Washington Post of yesterday may be incorporated in the Record. It is entitled "Navy in Jeopardy."

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The editorial is as follows:

[From the Washington Post, Sunday, February 12, 1933]

NAVY IN JEOPARDY

Congress threatens to reduce the United States Navy to a position of hopeless inferiority to the naval forces of Great Britain and Japan and to add nearly 15,000 men to the ranks of the unemployed. It is well that Senator BINGHAM inquired of Secretary Adams what the proposed 5 per cent cut in all appropriation bills would mean to the Navy. Otherwise the Navy bill might have slipped through without the public becoming aware of the drastic change in policy which the Senate contemplates.

The proposed cuts would force the Navy to suspend enlistments and reduce the enlisted personnel by 9,000 men. It would be necessary also to reduce the Marine Corps by 1,150 men, and 4,500 civilians would have to be discharged. Such a program could not be justified on any ground in view of the fact that the Navy is already 20,000 men short of the number necessary to man the ships in commission. How can Congress think of such action when the Government is endeavoring to induce private establishments to retain their employees and avoid aggravation of unemployment?

What is still more important is the effect of this proposed reduction on the naval building program. It would be necessary, says Secretary Adams, to "slow down the work on ships now building and modernizing, at great loss of time and increase of cost." A number of navy yards on the Atlantic coast would have to be closed. Thirty-three more ships would have to be put out of commission, bringing the total of inactive naval vessels to 82. Instead of maintaining parity with Great Britain and a ratio of 5 to 3 with Japan, the United States would then have barely one-half as many ships in service as Japan and about two-thirds as many as Great Britain.

Economy can be realized without crippling the Navy, as the Bratton amendment would do. The Senate was evidently ignorant of what the measure would mean to the Navy when it voted for this mutilation. Congress should exempt the Navy from the provisions of the Bratton amendment.

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. Mr. President, I trust that the conferees of the two bodies will give careful consideration to the very grave problems which have arisen.

WAR DEPARTMENT APPROPRIATIONS

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 14199) making appropriations for the military and nonmilitary activities of the War Department for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1934, and for other purposes.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, I wish to make a brief statement prior to the vote on the motion of the senior Senator from Michigan [Mr. COUZENS] to suspend the rule. I shall vote in favor of the Senator's motion, but I do not wish that vote to be taken as an indication of my approval of the method which he seeks to employ to meet the problem of the transient youths. In order that I may indicate that many of the people who appeared before the subcom-

mittee of the Committee on Manufactures in connection with the hearings upon the bill introduced by the junior Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CURTING], I wish to read briefly from testimony bearing upon the particular method which the Senator from Michigan seeks to employ as a means of solving in part the problem of the transient youth.

Miss Grace Abbott said:

Now, of course, if we say that it is a national responsibility the question arises as to whether the National Government itself should undertake direct care or whether it should do what it does in cooperation with the State or local community. It seems to me that it will be better done if it is done by the Federal Government in cooperation with the States.

There are several reasons for this. Of course, the first objective is that we should not encourage them to wander; we should not pull them out of their homes. Federal camps, agricultural camps, forestry or any other kind of work camps, if maintained by the Federal Government would, of course, get a great deal of publicity and attract many who would otherwise stay at home. Whereas, if the money is given to local communities through a responsible State agency, we would get more done with less publicity that might draw the boys away from their homes.

So it seems to me what the Federal Government can do is to supply the money and assist the States by making available to the State agencies information as to what is being done successfully in other States. It can cooperate in that way or occasionally lend personnel in developing plans, etc.

The testimony will be found on page 34 of the hearings. I also wish to invite attention to a statement made by Miss Judge, of Baltimore, connected with the Travelers Aid Society. She said:

Municipal aid, and even State aid, might well be given to those agencies to do this general type of care which from long experience they have been able to work out for this group, which means studying where they come from, if they can go back, and the State establishing them through agencies in those cities. If every possible extension of private agency and care will not give individualized care to all these groups, some camps of some sort or another may be necessary, but it seems to me that the extension of the social agencies which have been long experienced in this care is by far the most necessary thing to push to its utmost limits before we go over into the adoption of camps.

I also wish to quote briefly from the testimony of Mr. J. Prentice Murphy, of Philadelphia, who has long been connected with the activities of social agencies and the care of the underprivileged of that city. He said:

It has been suggested by some that the way to handle this problem is to put it on a country-wide basis under Army control as indicated, the probabilities being that the Army would use a number of large camp sites, the location being determined in part by weather conditions and centers of population. I have listened with amazement to some of the details of such a plan. If, for example, we were to set up camps of twenty or ten or even five thousand males between, as has been suggested, the ages of 17 and 25, we would instantly have created all of the problems surrounding military camps during the late war and we would instantly find ourselves lacking any of the technical training and education which would be required to conduct these camps on a civilian basis. If one will consider the different types of humanity which will be certain to present themselves for care, one can see that large scale or mass control, if continued beyond a very few days, would have disastrous effects on many of those in care.

There is a body of experience developed in the professional field of social work by those who have cared for children, both in and out of institutions, children of average conduct difficulties, and those presenting unusual conduct difficulties, which does have a bearing on this situation.

On the basis of any camp program, which thinks of the transients as simply in need of 6 or 9 or 12 months of care, and then dismissal, and assuming that these camps should, at the very outside, not exceed a capital of 500, I would have to tell you that there is not enough technical social-work ability and training in the whole United States which could be tapped for this job. These camps call for skilled personnel. The larger the camps, the greater the certainty of difficulties in the matter of training and discipline, the greater the certainty that large numbers of boys will be in danger of staying too long.

Further on he said:

The handling of the problems of social relations between camp inhabitants and the resident communities in which the camps are located will be profound and not easy of solution.

I wish to quote from a statement of E. L. Worthington, chairman of the farms committee of the Cleveland Employment Commission and president of the Cleveland Boys' Bureau. I may say in explanation that in Cleveland, under Mr. Worthington's direction, a conscientious effort has been made to meet in part at least, in so far as the funds were sufficient, the problem of the transient youth. Referring to

experiments near Cleveland, Mr. Worthington said, among other things:

We believe that small farms or work units of this kind scattered around the country would be far more effective than centralized camps with their attending problems of demobilization and discipline, to say nothing of transportation of men to and from these camps.

I might say just the other day I had a talk with Mr. Newton D. Baker and he now seems to favor the small unit as opposed to the large concentration camp, fearing, just as we do, the problems of demobilization and discipline.

I wish to refer to the statement made during the course of the testimony by Gen. Pelham D. Glassford. It might be well to state that General Glassford, prior to his appearance before the committee, had traveled through many sections of the country, but particularly through the southeastern section of the United States, making a study of the type of men and boys who are "on the road" and endeavoring to gather information upon which to predicate the suggestion of a solution of this most distressing problem. I now quote from his testimony:

Senator CURTING. Would you care to express any opinion about the size that those camps ought to be?

General GLASSFORD. Not over 750. I think a good average size would be around five or six hundred.

Senator CURTING. That, I suppose, would vary largely with the conditions in the States.

General GLASSFORD. It would.

His testimony is found on page 131. In further explanation, it might be appropriate to suggest that the camps which General Glassford had in mind were camps composed solely of transient youth.

I refer to the testimony to be found on page 169 of Mr. Eric H. Marks, chairman of the Welfare Council of New York City, New York. Mr. Marks has had a great deal to do with the administration of the experimental camps in the Bear Mountain Park, to which men taken from the city lodging houses were sent so that they might work in the woods in that park. He testifies as follows:

Senator CURTING. Under such a system, I suppose in New York you could provide camps of this same kind for transients?

Mr. MARKS. Yes; we could. We are hoping to be able to do so with the limited funds available. Mr. Hopkins tells us he thinks he can help us to take care of 1,000 men. When you figure there are over 15,000 homeless men in New York City alone every night, and we are taking 1,000 out of that list, you can see we are just beginning to make a dent in the whole problem.

We see no reason whatsoever why camps of this type can not be established far and wide.

Referring, of course, to the camp which I mentioned before quoting from his testimony. He continues:

We do not believe in large concentration camps. We do not think you can do the same type of work with the men in large camps. We feel that frequently the expense of getting men up to those camps is out of line with the amount of good you can do with the money in other ways. But, if you have a large number of camps in various communities where a public improvement can be accomplished, it costs very little more than feeding and housing the men. The men are paying back a good part of the wages for their maintenance and are delighted to do it. These men are paid for 12 hours a week work in the park. They are working on an average of seven to eight hours a day, and no question has arisen as to where the money is coming from, how much work they are doing, whether they should get more money or not. They are going out cheerfully and happily and are delighted.

I have cited excerpts from the testimony of those who are well informed concerning the problem of the care of transient youths and men, women, and girls because I wanted to indicate that there is not full approval among those individuals of the particular method which the Senator from Michigan seeks to employ as a solution of a part of the problem of destitution relief. But, Mr. President, I can not vote against the motion to suspend the rule proposed by the Senator from Michigan, for, after 69 or more days that this Congress has been in session, this is the first time that any legislation has come before this body which bears directly upon the suffering of millions of persons in the United States. I have endeavored since I have been a Member of the Senate not to make rash or exaggerated statements; but I say, after listening to the testimony of men and women who are in the front-line trenches of this

losing battle against human misery in the United States, that I am unable to find words in the English language adequately to picture the mass suffering on the part of innocent men, women, and children in the United States to-day. The cold wave which has just swept over the United States has added to the untold misery of millions in this country. Therefore, Mr. President, I shall vote for the motion submitted by the Senator from Michigan, because I want his proposal to be considered upon its merits. I wish to pay tribute to the Senator from Michigan for the sympathy which he has indicated in the solution of this problem. It is consistent with his actions not only as a public servant but as a private citizen in his own community and in his own State.

The bill introduced by the Senator from Colorado [Mr. COSTIGAN] and myself, seeking to deal with the entire problem of unemployment relief, is pending upon the calendar. I have waited patiently, day after day, in the hope that an opportunity would be presented whereby that measure could come up and be considered on its merits. I was encouraged on Saturday to hear the senior Senator from Arkansas [Mr. ROBINSON], the minority leader, state that the unemployment relief bill must be taken up by the Senate within a day or two.

I realize, Mr. President, that in a legislative body there must be some cooperation in evolving a program, and, therefore, I have endeavored to cooperate with the leaders on both sides of the Chamber in facilitating the consideration of business pressing before the country and the Congress. However, I wish to state, upon my responsibility as a Senator, that I believe the failure of the present Congress to deal with problems directly affecting the welfare of the people of the United States is destroying the faith of those people in their Government.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The time of the Senator on the pending question has expired.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Then I will take additional time on the bill. If the present session of Congress shall adjourn, Mr. President, without the enactment of legislation for the relief of the millions of men, women, and children who are hungry, destitute, cold, and desperate, it will destroy the faith of millions of innocent victims of the depression in their Government.

The Senate of the United States should begin to meet regularly in night session in order that unemployment-relief legislation, legislation affecting the relief of agriculture, and legislation providing for relief in the way of establishing new procedures in bankruptcy cases in the courts may be given a hearing at this session.

We have spent all of the days of this session upon legislation which has no direct bearing upon the acute distress of millions of the people. We spent the first part of the session on the Glass bill. With many provisions of that measure I am in sympathy, but that bill, if enacted, will not put bread into the mouths of hungry children; it will not provide fuel to protect against cold.

In the city of Pittsburgh, for example—and Pittsburgh is not exceptional—fuel has been provided during the winter only once, and that was in the cold spell of last December. People are living in crowded quarters, without provision for fuel, and in many instances without provision for light or running water. We have spent the remainder of the time considering appropriation bills which do not take effect until the 1st of July next. It is high time that the attention of Congress should be turned to legislation designed to stop the spread of hunger, starvation, want, destitution, cold, and the breakdown of health in the United States.

I hope, Mr. President, that the leaders on both sides of the Chamber will agree shortly that the Senate must meet, as a regular procedure, in night session. I hope also that no further appropriation bills will be taken up for consideration by this body until some of the general legislation affecting the welfare of millions of men, women, and children in the United States shall be given a hearing. As I stated a moment ago, I realize that cooperation is necessary in formulating a legislative program. I shall go just as far

as I can in the effort to cooperate; but the time will come, Mr. President, when we will have to raise the question as to whether or not the Congress is to adjourn without passing legislation affecting the welfare of the millions of helpless men, women, and children, and when that hour arrives I shall take whatever responsibility may be necessary in order to force the issue in this Chamber.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Michigan to suspend the rule.

Mr. COUZENS. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. COPELAND. Mr. President, will the Senator withhold that motion?

Mr. COUZENS. For what purpose?

Mr. COPELAND. I wish to say a word about the matter.

Mr. COUZENS. Let us have a quorum first.

Mr. COPELAND. Oh, no.

Mr. COUZENS. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Ashurst	Cutting	Kendrick	Shipstead
Austin	Dale	Keyes	Shortridge
Bailey	Davis	King	Smith
Bankhead	Dickinson	La Follette	Smoot
Barbour	Dill	Lewis	Stelwer
Barkley	Fess	Logan	Stephens
Bingham	Fletcher	McKellar	Swanson
Blaine	Frazier	McNary	Thomas, Idaho
Borah	George	Moses	Thomas, Okla.
Bratton	Glass	Neely	Townsend
Brookhart	Glenn	Norris	Trammell
Bulkley	Goldsborough	Nye	Tydings
Bulow	Gore	Oddie	Vandenberg
Byrnes	Grammer	Patterson	Wagner
Capper	Hale	Pittman	Walcott
Caraway	Harrison	Reed	Walsh, Mass.
Clark	Hastings	Reynolds	Walsh, Mont.
Connally	Hatfield	Robinson, Ark.	Watson
Coolidge	Hayden	Robinson, Ind.	White
Copeland	Hull	Russell	
Costigan	Johnson	Schuyler	
Couzens	Kean	Sheppard	

The VICE PRESIDENT. Eighty-five Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, it is always an uncomfortable part to play to oppose an amendment that is offered for the purpose of relieving distress. I feel it my duty, however, to oppose this amendment for reasons that I ought to be able to explain very briefly.

To begin with, every one of us must appreciate the sincerity and depth of feeling that inspires the Senator from Michigan [Mr. COUZENS] in proposing this amendment. By his own amazing private philanthropies he has proven his interest in the young people of the country, and his desire to help them.

I share his feelings with regard to this group of young men who are rapidly becoming tramps. Whether or not the numbers are exaggerated, I have no means of knowing. It certainly must be that the same young men appear in the charity rolls in several communities, because they are migratory; they are demanding help first here, and then there; and it would give the impression that there is a larger number than actually exists. At the same time, there doubtless is a considerable number; and I am not inclined to be a stickler on the method that is adopted to help them.

I understand that the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] has a bill pending for an appropriation to the States in aid of relief for this class of young men; and, while I do not know the details of that bill and have not had a chance to study it, my impression is that I will support it. I understand that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CURRING] has introduced a somewhat similar bill, and I should not be a stickler when the question comes to voting on those bills.

Coming now, however, to the amendment that is before us, I desire to call the attention of the Senate to just what it provides:

That any unmarried male person may apply without enlistment to any military post of the United States; and, if he is between 17 and 24 years of age, and if he gives satisfactory evidence that he is unemployed and has been for six months, then he must be admitted.

Mark you, Mr. President, there is no limit as to number. There is no limit as to citizenship. These may be aliens who apply, and doubtless in our coast cities many of them will be aliens. There is no limit to the number to be taken in at each particular post, and we can readily imagine the flood of applicants that will show up at Governors Island, for example. There is no limit as to health; and under this amendment as it stands a young man with a contagious disease might apply and he would be bound to be accepted, and, of course, would immediately go into the military hospital, or else run the risk of spreading infection in the camp.

When they are admitted, there is nothing said as to their occupation or their discipline except the general statement that they shall "be subject to the customary discipline maintained at such post." That is very nice; but it is impossible to enforce it without more than that. Would they be subject to court-martial? Apparently they would not, because they would not be enlisted.

As for their occupation, all that is said in the amendment is that they "shall participate in all forms of beneficial and healthful exercise and vocational training as far as practicable with existing facilities."

Very well. Who is going to peel the potatoes? Who is going to scrub the floors? Who is going to cook the meals? Who is going to do all the police work of keeping their camps in order? It is not "beneficial and healthful exercise" to wash dishes, and it is not "vocational training" to scrub floors; and no method is provided for that.

It will be said that I am inventing difficulties. I am in full sympathy with almost everything that was said by the Senator from Michigan [Mr. COUZENS] and by his colleague [Mr. VANDENBERG]; but we are not called upon to vote on their speeches. We are called upon to vote on the amendment as it lies before us.

Mr. COUZENS. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Pennsylvania yield to the Senator from Michigan?

Mr. REED. I do.

Mr. COUZENS. Is it not a fact that if the rules are suspended, this proposal may be amended in any form?

Mr. REED. Surely.

Mr. COUZENS. I think the Senator is rather unfair to talk about the amendment as it is, when it may be amended, especially in view of the fact that his committee made no effort to amend the measure so as to make it more adaptable to the requirements.

Mr. REED. I shall explain in a moment just how the Senator's ends can be more properly attained, I think; but we have no text to speak to except the amendment as he has presented it, and I am offering my reasons for objecting to it.

I can not imagine anything more demoralizing in the Southern States than to tell the young boys, white and black, who live in those States that all they have to do is to stay idle for six months, and then the Government will take care of them and house them and feed them and clothe them, without any effort on their part except "beneficial and healthful exercise."

I was down in South Carolina for a few days at Christmas week, and I made some inquiries about the rate of wages that was prevailing there among the colored folk in the country districts. I heard of some who were working for as little as a dollar a week in cash, plus a bare cabin to live in and an occasional bushel of corn, worth down there about 25 cents. Imagine how it would appeal to youngsters of that group to be told that they are going to be taken into an Army camp, not have to work, and be maintained by the Government at a cost of \$250 a year. I use that figure because I have an estimate from the Army this morning which says that if the number be limited to 88,000, as the Senator from Michigan indicated he would do, so that no new encampments would have to be constructed, the total cost of maintaining them would be about \$250 per year, or about \$22,000,000 for the 88,000 young men who would be taken in.

Imagine the problem, then, that would confront the commandant of each of these military posts. He would have more of these young boarders on his hands than he would have of enlisted men, because at the present time in continental United States there are only 83,000 enlisted men, and there would be 88,000 of these guests at the Army posts.

What would be the effect upon the military personnel of the Army of having this great group of practically idle young men visiting there at the post, not charged with any of the duties that go to make the life of the average enlisted man a fairly hard one? What would be the effect upon the young men themselves of that prolonged idleness at Government expense?

As was pointed out by the Senator from Washington [Mr. GRAMMER] a little while ago, many a youngster who had been idle three or four months, and who was offered a job, would refuse it in order to qualify with the six months of unemployment that is necessary to take advantage of this proposal.

Then the Senator from Washington also made an interesting suggestion with regard to pensions. When we remember that half of the American Army in the World War never got abroad, and that their average service in the Army was much less than a year, and when we remember the throng of them who now crowd our pension rolls and who are drawing compensation from the Government for diseases supposed to be connected with that short peaceful tenure of life in the Army, we can easily imagine that we will lay ourselves open to a host of similar applications from this group.

Mr. President, I have told what I do not like about the Senator's amendment. I am now going to offer some suggestions as to plans which would attain the same end in a better way, which I would be glad to vote for.

First, I would be glad to vote to provide that these young men might be taken in by regular enlistment in the Army so that they would be on a parity exactly with the enlisted men with whom they would associate at the Army posts. I would be glad to vote for an amendment seeking to bring that about, and the way to accomplish it would be to raise the amounts appropriated in this bill for pay of the Army, subsistence, and what not.

Mr. FESS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. REED. I yield.

Mr. FESS. Would the Senator require the same qualifications which are necessary now to enable one to enter the Army?

Mr. REED. Of course, we would. The process of enlistment to-day implies selection and strict examination, and those only are taken who appear to be of good moral character, and who appear to be physically fit and mentally fit. The pending amendment has in it no restrictions whatever like that. A man might take advantage of this amendment if he were feeble-minded, he might go in if he were far gone in tuberculosis. Of course, any such process of enlistment would have to be subject to the restrictions which now apply.

Mr. FESS. The Senator will understand that my inquiry is based on the suggestion of the duty of the Government to take care of the men from a humanitarian standpoint. That is why I was asking whether the Senator would include everybody, or just those fit.

Mr. REED. The Senator from Michigan proposes in his speech, though he does not say it in the amendment, to take care of 88,000 young men. Obviously, if we take care of 88,000 healthy young men, we will be doing just as much to relieve distress as if we took the least effective of this group to the same number. Eighty-eight thousand individuals would be taken care of either way. What I propose is that the Army shall be given 88,000 healthy ones, and not just 88,000 assorted individuals. That is the first thing I would be willing to agree to.

I realize perfectly well that neither the country nor the Congress would sanction an increase in the enlisted strength of the Regular Army of 88,000 men. At the present time our total enlisted strength, at home and abroad, is 118,750.

Obviously, 88,000 would be about an 80 per cent addition, and I doubt whether the country would stand for it. But if we want to take care of the young men in the right way, that is one way of doing it.

Mr. FESS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield again?

Mr. REED. I yield.

Mr. FESS. I have not made any study of the character of persons who are "floating," looking for work. What proportion does the Senator think would be cared for if it depended upon enlistment under the present Army regulations and with the discipline that would be required?

Mr. REED. Of course, a good many of them are tramps. A great many of them are not tramps; they are just youngsters who, with no occupation, are unhappy at home and may go out to see the world. I have no means of knowing the numbers. I have letters from social workers who tell me that they are not all admirable characters by any means, but I do not suppose they are getting any better leading this kind of a life. That is one of the reasons why the Senator from Michigan wants to take care of them, and very properly.

Mr. CUTTING. Mr. President, I may say to the Senator that the evidence submitted to the subcommittee of the Committee on Manufactures was that, on the whole, about 10 per cent belong to the so-called hobo or tramp type, and that about 90 per cent were genuine seekers for employment when they started out on their wanderings.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The time of the Senator from Pennsylvania upon the motion has expired. He now has 15 minutes on the bill.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, we must remember that this restriction of the amendment to these migratory young men is only in the speeches which have been made on it, and not in the amendment itself. There is nothing in the amendment which would prevent any youngster who is now living happily at home, if he has reached the age of 17, from picking up and going over to Fort Myer and saying, "I am here to stay." While the speeches refer to the migratory group, the amendment refers to every unmarried man in the United States between 17 and 24, provided he has been out of work six months. Both migratory and stationary citizens are included, and aliens as well.

The second way in which these young could be taken care of, if it is the will of the Congress that they should be, is by an extension of the citizens' military training camp principle, and while the Senator from Michigan said on Saturday that military training for these young men was not contemplated by him, his colleague said to-day that the improvement in citizenship which came from the citizens' military training camps was so great that he favored the application of that system to this group of young men.

Mr. President, I would cheerfully vote for that. That, too, involves the process of selection. A young man with a criminal record, a young man with a contagious disease, a young man who is feeble-minded, is not taken into the citizens' military training camp. He is not acceptable there. We do not want those healthy in body and mind to be thrown with those who are diseased in body and mind. Consequently, we take only the good ones to the citizens' military training camp, and reject the others.

If the Senator from Michigan would propose that, it would be very easy to accomplish what he desires. Let him simply add to the item in the pending appropriation bill for the citizens' military training camp. Under the national defense act there is ample authority to take in the young men to whom he refers, to house them, to feed them, to clothe them, and to give them military training.

Mr. COUZENS. For how long?

Mr. REED. The time is not limited. The national defense act prescribes no limitation of time whatsoever. That process, which would take care of the young men just as well as any other, would do it subject to such restrictions that they would not run the risk of being more harmed than helped. I would be glad to vote for an amendment looking to that end, and that is the way to do it, just add \$22,000,000 to the bill, or \$250 per man, to this appropria-

tion, and, as far as the money goes, that group will be taken care of.

The citizens' military training camps are operated now for four weeks apiece, but there is nothing in the national defense act which prescribes that limit of four weeks. The Secretary of War would have power, under the present law, to operate the camps for 12 months, or 6 months, or whatever our wish or his decision should be, considering the best interests of these young men.

Mr. President, what I have suggested can be done. The system is in existence, the buildings are provided, and the War Department knows how to handle it.

Mr. HATFIELD. Mr. President, how many in number would the citizens' military training camps take care of?

Mr. REED. They have taken as high as 40,000 during the summer period. They have barracks and tentage sufficient to take care of 88,000, according to the War Department, and if the Congress wants to do it, and wants to do it in the best-established method, which is entirely satisfactory to these young men who do attend in the summer time—and I may say they are all enthusiastic about it—what I have suggested is the shipshape, workmanlike way to do it.

Mr. President, all the restrictions would apply which I have urged should apply. In the first place, only American citizens would be taken, and not aliens, as would be the case under the amendment. In the next place, only young men of good reputation would be taken, and that is the kind we want to save. In the next place, only those who are sound of mind would be taken, and the other kind belong in asylums and not in camps. Next, only those who are healthy of body would be taken. We do not want to spread contagion among these young people under the guise of helping them.

Mr. President, if the Senator would move to suspend the rules in order to increase the appropriation for the citizens' military training camps I doubt whether there would be a vote cast against it; but as to his amendment as it stands, I should feel it my duty to vote against it.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. Mr. President, what would the Senator do with the other boys—those who would not qualify?

Mr. REED. Just what the Senator from Michigan would do with them; they would have to get such relief as they could at their own homes. Under any plan we could take care of only 88,000.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. I thought the proposal of the Senator from Michigan assumed that the boys could not be taken care of at home.

Mr. REED. Of course, I do not mean at their own homes; I mean in their home communities. Those of unsound mind would have to be taken to the asylums, for example.

Mr. COPELAND obtained the floor.

Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. President—

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from New York yield to the Senator from California?

Mr. JOHNSON. I did not know the Senator had the floor. I desire to address the Senate.

Mr. COPELAND. Mr. President, I shall not detain the Senate long, and I hope the Senator from California will go on with his remarks very soon.

I am very much interested in the plan proposed by the Senator from Michigan. I know the difficulties, and I realize the reluctance of the War Department and the reasons for that reluctance. I appreciate that it is embarrassing to military discipline to have in the same encampment soldiers and civilians.

I was a member of the subcommittee of the Committee on the District of Columbia which tried to devise some means of dealing with the bonus army when it came here and, as a member of that subcommittee, went to call upon the Secretary of War. We suggested to him that it might be possible to take care of the bonus marchers in some of the near-by military establishments. The Secretary of War pointed out, very properly, the difficulty he would have if there were a mixture of civilians with soldiers. He spoke of Fort Hunt, I think it was, which he said had been abandoned as a place of military occupation in the sense of having large

numbers of troops there, but which, he stated, was in the hands of caretakers. I do not quote what the Secretary said; but the impression I got was that in a place like that, with some hard-boiled Army sergeants to maintain discipline, civilians, probably those who had had military training—and that was the group we were discussing at the time—might be taken care of, or might take care of themselves.

Mr. FESS. Mr. President, in order that the Senator may be accurate, Fort Hunt has been discontinued as a military post, and has been turned over to Colonel Grant, the head of the National Capital Park and Planning Commission.

Mr. COPELAND. I am glad to be corrected.

Mr. REED. Fort Hunt has been abandoned by the War Department as an obsolete post.

Mr. COPELAND. That is the type of institution which I have in my mind at this moment. There are in my State several more or less abandoned Army posts, among others old Fort Ontario at Oswego, N. Y., Fort Niagara which has been recently restored, near Niagara Falls. I am not advised how many there are of such posts around the country, but I have no doubt there are a good many of them.

I think I share the feeling of the Senator from Pennsylvania regarding the difficulties involved in taking these young men into any establishment to which they might apply, but, Mr. President, we are dealing with a very critical situation in this country. I sometimes think we are so sheltered and sequestered here in the Senate that we fail to realize the physical sufferings of millions of our citizens. I was in New York on Saturday and yesterday. I saw thousands of men shoveling snow. Many of those men, I was told, had not had any work of any sort for a long, long time. Really, Mr. President, I felt ashamed of myself as I rode in a comfortable taxicab, wearing a warm overcoat and a pair of gloves, when I saw many of those men without overcoats and without gloves or mittens in the nipping air of New York yesterday morning; I was truly ashamed.

There is something about age, and perhaps that is one of the compensations of age, that hardens us physically and mentally to the deprivations of life. We come to expect these things. But youth has no such philosophy. Whence come the revolutions and the uprisings of history? Did they come from old men? Youth!

It is not a good thing for our country to have so many youths roaming the country. If I remember the record, I think the Senator from Michigan said there are 300,000 itinerant boys floating around the country to-day, 300,000 just at the turning point of life. These are the years when the nature of the men and their attitude toward life will be determined. They are at the age when they may become tramps and possibly criminals, but on the other hand, with proper encouragement, they might develop into citizens of the highest character and in the future might render great service to the country.

In Europe two or three years ago I saw marching clubs, great groups of young people were marching about the country. I believe in marching clubs so long as they march on peaceful errands. But I do not want to see grow up in our country revolutionary thoughts in the minds of our youth. That is why I have such sympathy for what the Senator from Michigan proposes, and why I hope there may be found a way to overcome the practical objections to the plan.

The Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. REED] called attention to the defects of the proposal of the Senator from Michigan. I agree with him that there are serious defects, but the Senator from Michigan has suggested that if we give him the right to present the matter it can be perfected.

The Senator from Pennsylvania points out that no provision is made regarding the health of the men who are to go into these camps, the implication of his remarks being that they need to be men of prime physical make-up. Of course we differ always about things here. So far as I am concerned, the man who is lacking in food and emaciated

and debilitated by reason of the poverty which he has suffered during the past two or three years, is the very kind of a man I want to help, and presents the very reason why I want him to be given the benefits of this plan. I would not have him go into camp with a specific disease or illness which might be passed on to the detriment of others, but so far as concerns the disabilities which are associated with lack of nourishment and lack of proper clothing and lack of shelter, we should take pride in doing what we can to restore the men to health.

Mr. FLETCHER. Mr. President—

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from New York yield to the Senator from Florida?

Mr. COPELAND. I am glad to yield.

Mr. FLETCHER. It seems to me one of the very serious objections to the procedure is that there is no plan made whereby the boys may do any work. They ought to be busy at some occupation and trained in some vocation. They ought to be at work a little and not simply enjoying a vacation at the expense of the Government without doing anything at all, or without doing those things which would be really beneficial to them. That is what I am afraid of, as well as the objection about a rotten apple in a barrel of sound apples. We are liable to mix up some rotten apples with the good apples and do more harm than good and spoil the whole plan.

I was reading last night a very interesting book by Frederick Van Wyck, entitled "Recollections of an Old New Yorker." At page 267 of the book he said:

From 1873 to 1879 the depression was in full force, although not called a depression. The bread line was long and men stood all night in the bitter cold in hopes of getting a morsel to eat, with no stockings on their feet, holes in their shoes, no underwear, no overcoats, many with only a shirt and a pair of trousers to cover them.

That was in the great city of New York in 1873 to 1879. That city seems to have survived and come through pretty well, everything considered.

To-day you do not see one man without an overcoat—

That may not be entirely true, although he is speaking from personal knowledge.

To-day you do not see one man without an overcoat, hat, underwear, and nearly everyone with a package of cigarettes in his pocket.

At another place he said:

Young boys and girls by the thousands roamed the streets and slept in doorways or alleys huddled together to keep warm.

Continuing, he said:

The financiers and bankers lost their heads, as they always do in case of panic.

They called it a panic in those days, and not a depression. It might be of interest to the Senator if he would read the book. These conditions obtained in those days, and yet they managed in some way without Federal aid, and I do not think they even had State aid to conquer the situation.

Mr. COPELAND. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Florida. I agree with some of the suggestions he has made, but perhaps I disagree with others. Certainly when we compare the conditions of 1933 with the conditions of 1873 to 1879 mentioned by the author quoted, we are not dealing with two problems which are identical in any real sense. There was poverty in those days, and there is poverty in these days; but in my State of New York there are to-day 1,000,000 families being taken care of by charity—almost one-half the families in that State.

Never before in our history was there another situation such as this. I admit that it resembles the other one in one particular—that the bankers lost their heads then and they have lost their heads now. If we could get the bankers to resume activities and have the banks function as banks instead of pawnshops, we might hope for some recovery; but the bankers have hysteria. As the result of it their banks are not functioning. We have all sorts of schemes to inflate the currency, to lessen the amount of gold in the dollar, and all sorts of schemes to get more money.

But, Mr. President, we do not need more money in the banks. We need more money in circulation. Those schemes will not help to cure poverty.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The time of the Senator from New York on the amendment has expired.

Mr. COPELAND. Mr. President, I will continue on the bill.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from New York is recognized for 15 minutes on the bill.

Mr. COPELAND. The problem is to get the money into circulation. If I knew a doctor who had failed as miserably in the practice of medicine as the bankers have failed in the practice of banking, I would appear against him myself in court and hope to have him sent to jail for 10 years for malpractice. I agree with the Senator from Florida about the bankers.

But, Mr. President, we are talking about opening camps to these young men. I agree with the Senator from Florida that we must not make them idlers in the camps. If they go into these camps they must go there to maintain and observe the same routine that the soldiers observe. I would have them do practically everything in the camps that the soldiers do. I think I would be willing to have them drill even with wooden guns. I do not care about that part of it. But I would have them peel the potatoes and do the serving and that sort of thing. At the same time I would give them setting-up exercises and guard their health and try to restore them to vigorous manhood. There is nothing that causes a man to think straight except to have a straight and healthy body. Unless good red blood courses through the veins of these men they can not think straight.

I hope that we will give the Senator from Michigan an opportunity to have his measure perfected in order that it may be presented to the Senate in a form which will be acceptable.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President—

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from New York yield to the Senator from Idaho?

Mr. COPELAND. I yield.

Mr. BORAH. I agree with the Senator. I think the Senator from Michigan ought to be given an opportunity to present the amendment on its merits; but in connection with the amendment, it seems to me the key to a successful dealing with the question presented is to find something for these boys to do while they are in control of the Government, some activity in which they would take some interest. When that difficulty shall be worked out to a reasonable degree, I shall be heartily in favor of the pending proposal.

Mr. COPELAND. I thank the Senator for what he has said. This is my thought about it; and I would like to say this to the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. REED], because he knows better than most of us here about the practical difficulties. I have thought that if we would give permission to the Senator from Michigan to present the subject so that it could be dealt with in connection with the bill we might then perfect his amendment as best we may on the floor; and then in conference, with the officials of the War Department present, there might be worked out a practicable plan. The Army men are wise; they have learned how to keep men in camps happy and contented and engaged in physical activities which make for health and vigor; and I believe it would be possible to work out a plan here which would do what the Senator from Florida and also the Senator from Idaho have in mind, namely, put these men in Army camps not as loafers but to accomplish something in the way of education and development which would make them better citizens by reason of their experience in the camps.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, will the Senator from New York yield to me?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from New York yield to the Senator from Pennsylvania?

Mr. COPELAND. I yield.

Mr. REED. What the Senator from New York suggests may very easily be done by enlarging the amount appro-

riated and applying the restrictions which govern the citizens' military training camps. There we have the element of selectivity; the unfit, the "rotten apples," about which the Senator from Florida spoke, are excluded. Nobody has a vested right to enter the citizens' military training camps; only boys of sound mind and body, with good reputations, are accepted. I do not mean to say that they have to be physical giants, by any means, because they do gain weight, they are all built up physically, by attending these camps.

The way to do then, the way to provide that selectivity, the way to insure the power of discipline, which is necessary, the way to exclude aliens, and all that, is to follow the citizens' military training camp example, which has been tested and proved to be successful. The way to accomplish it is to increase the item of appropriation on page 59, line 12, by \$22,000,000. That is what the War Department now estimates it would cost to take care of 88,000 young men.

Mr. COPELAND. To what page did the Senator refer?

Mr. REED. I referred to page 59, line 12, where the appropriation is made for the citizens' military training camps.

It will be objected that the practice is to limit those camps to one month during the summer, but I have just refreshed my recollection by looking at the national defense act, and I find that that limitation is not statutory; and, if the appropriation is increased in the way I suggest, the War Department will have authority to keep those camps open 12 months in the year; the money thus appropriated will provide for them, and the established system will furnish all the precautions we need.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President—

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from New York yield to the Senator from Idaho?

Mr. COPELAND. I yield.

Mr. BORAH. I desire to ask the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. REED] a question in the time of the Senator from New York. What kind of work or mental entertainment or mental exercise would these boys have? Would it be confined entirely to military discipline and training?

Mr. REED. Oh, by no means. The citizens' military training camps have classes in government, classes in a number of subjects about which all citizens ought to know. Their class work is nearly as important as is their physical drill. They have time for sports, but not too much time; they have time for drill or are given drill, but not too much drill. The effort is to turn them out as rounded citizens when they leave the camps.

Mr. BORAH. If a boy had a desire or a taste for a particular vocation, to equip himself for a particular vocation, is the latitude such that he might be able to do so?

Mr. REED. I should think that could easily be arranged. Of course, they are not perfect trade schools, but if a boy wants to learn anything that the Army has facilities for teaching, I am sure they will be glad to teach him.

Mr. COPELAND. Mr. President, just one word.

Mr. WAGNER and Mr. SMITH addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from New York yield further; and if so, to whom?

Mr. COPELAND. I shall yield in just a moment. The only objection I have to the regulations of the citizens' military training camps is that I think they require too much on the physical side for the men we have in mind, but I suppose that matter could be arranged by the regulations of the Army itself.

Mr. REED. Quite so. After all, we are only planning to take care of 88,000 young men, and it does not matter which individuals out of that group we take.

Mr. WAGNER. Mr. President—

Mr. COPELAND. I now yield to my colleague.

Mr. WAGNER. If the Senator will yield, I wish to make the suggestion that to employ the selective system would be to exclude the very men who most need this aid. We all know that in the case of most of these men and boys there has been a deterioration, both moral and physical, in process, and we want to arrest that deterioration. Those of the

younger men who need this aid most are those whose deterioration has extended furthest.

Mr. REED. If the senior Senator from New York will yield to me to answer that suggestion, let me say that the Army is not a reform school and never will be, and it would be a great injustice to the better ones of the group to take in men of criminal tendencies. We could not undertake to do that.

Mr. WAGNER. I am not speaking about men of criminal tendencies; I would not make such a reflection upon these men. I am speaking of the men who, because they have been out of employment for several years, wandering around the country, have become physically debilitated; they have undergone physical hardships and have deteriorated.

Mr. REED. They are undernourished.

Mr. WAGNER. They are undernourished.

Mr. REED. Undernourishment is not going to exclude anybody.

Mr. WAGNER. Those are the men who mostly need this aid, and that is the type of individual we are trying to reclaim who would be excluded by the selective process.

Mr. REED. The Senator has not understood me. I think when we get on common ground we will agree. Surely the Senator will agree with me that we ought not take individuals far gone in tuberculosis, we will say, and put them into barracks, sleeping in close contact with healthy boys. That is all I mean.

Mr. WAGNER. Of course, there would have to be a restriction in that aspect of the matter.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President—

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from New York yield to the Senator from Maryland?

Mr. COPELAND. I yield.

Mr. TYDINGS. Does not the Senator think that we should limit the membership in these camps to boys who are not economically self-sufficient? In other words, instead of limiting it to healthy boys who may have parents in a position to provide for them, the intent of the Senator from Michigan is limited to that class of young men who are forced out of their homes through economic disaster?

Mr. REED. I have no doubt in the world that after the debate that has gone on here the Secretary of War would feel himself obliged to use this money in exactly that way.

Mr. TYDINGS. Would not the Senator feel that, without being too rigid, we should provide a definition in the amendment and make certain that the boys who go into these camps are the class of boys who have no families or who, for one reason or another, are wanderers, rather than to allow to enter these camps boys who have homes?

Mr. REED. We might exclude some deserving cases if we provide such a limitation unless the language was very carefully guarded.

Mr. COPELAND. Mr. President, I want to say just a word further. I am sure my colleague realizes that I am in the fullest accord with him regarding the admission to these camps of men who may be physically unfit from a military standpoint, for such a restriction would be calamitous. I think it would be absurd to open our camps for men who are so fit as to meet the military standard; but we should admit to the camps men who have become deteriorated through years of distress, not men with tuberculosis or physical diseases, of course, but men who are simply undernourished by reason of the lack of food and the distressing conditions under which they live.

Mr. President, we are so close together in this matter that I think it would be a pity, indeed, if we did not permit the Senator from Michigan to present the amendment in perfected form in order that we may get final action.

Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. President, it is a matter of very deep regret to those who hold views similar to my own that until this time in the present session we have not in reality dealt with any bill which is designed to relieve human distress. We have been very ready and alert to deal with the banking situation; we have dealt, indeed, with other problems that have been confronting us; but until now, Mr.

President, we have not in any respect dealt with just human misery; and, sir, to me that is not only the most absorbing but is the most important problem with which legislatures ought to be concerned. Now, sir, we have presented for the first time a measure that touches at least a problem of grave consequence to us, and touches it in a fashion that affects the hearts of all of us, for we are dealing with boys, boys who, without fault on their part, have been compelled to go forth upon the highways and the byways, from dire necessity seeking some way in which they may merely exist; and that problem, appealing as it is, though it presents itself in a form which may not be acceptable to all of us, even though in an amendment to which all of us could object upon certain specified details, is nevertheless a problem that we ought in some way endeavor to solve.

I had hoped that by this time in this session the La Follette-Costigan bill or the Cutting bill or the Wagner bill—to me all important measures, with which I am in sympathy—would be before this body and we would act upon them. I had hoped, as was suggested by the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LA FOLLETTE] in the speech he made to-day, that there would have been time in this session to have dealt with problems of that sort. I can not feel any optimism as to Congress dealing with them in the remaining days of the present session. We have, if you will recall, Mr. President, the realism of this particular situation, two weeks more of this session. We follow, as I understand the program that has been agreed upon, the pending measure with a measure involving the prohibition law. If anybody here labors under the delusion that the measure in reference to the prohibition law will be finished in 15 minutes or in 15 hours, he has, it seems to me, "another think coming," for we will then be dealing with something as to which our experience has taught us we can not reach a conclusion in any brief period.

So here in reality is the first and here is the last opportunity that this Congress has to deal with the question of human misery in this land. I will deal with it in any way, and I will take almost any chance in the endeavor to relieve a bit of the distress that now afflicts the youth of our country.

I do not care whether it is a serious problem for the military authorities or not; I readily concede that it is; but they must have their problem in this time, as all the rest of us have our problems and as these young men have their problems; and there is no more important problem confronting the people of the United States to-day than the problem of relieving want and cold and starvation and hunger and destitution; and that problem comes to us now in this particular measure.

Mr. WAGNER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from California yield to the Senator from New York?

Mr. JOHNSON. I yield.

Mr. WAGNER. I am a little bit apprehensive because of the description by the Senator of the hopelessness of the situation. Does not the Senator feel that there is ample time left in this session if we are determined to deal with this grave problem of relief for the destitute and employment for the unemployed?

Mr. JOHNSON. I hope so; but, sir, my experience has taught me that my hope will be quite in vain, because it is obvious to the Senator that with but two weeks more of this session remaining and with the prohibition measure to come before us next it will be well nigh impossible to put over a real measure dealing with the problem of human distress and have it passed by the other House and become a law; and perhaps there are other reasons, too, with which the Senator is familiar, which will preclude the possibility of laws like he and I have been advocating upon this floor from becoming actualities and becoming laws of the land. And so, Mr. President, having presented to us this problem to-day, let us solve it as we can.

The debate has been of inestimable value. It is not now a question wherein there is a very marked diversity of opinion, for the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. REED] readily and kindly and generously concedes that he is ready

to go forward in any fashion that may be appropriate in order to accomplish the desired result. So we may start with the premise, in any discussion of what we are dealing with now, that all admit the necessity for action; that all admit that there is a problem of superlative importance to be dealt with by us; that all want to solve that problem; and it may be that we are required to take the old Rooseveltian theory of trial and error. If that be so, let us take it, and let us try; and if we err, well and good. The problem requires and demands the particular effort.

I became conscious of this problem some time ago, and I began to investigate it as best I could. In the State of California, from which I come, the idea of camps for transients has been in operation now for more than a year. It is true those camps are not in large units, and there are but 4,000 or thereabouts that are accommodated in the camps; but they do exist, and they have done a most remarkable work there.

All of the fears that the communities near by might have felt concerning those camps have been dissipated by the experience respecting them. Young men and old, it is true, are taken into those camps. It is quite true that they provide employment of a certain sort—sometimes 2 days a week, sometimes 4 days a week, of 6 hours a day. No salaries are paid; but the men who are in those camps have grown happy in them, and they have been prevented from starving in a land of plenty.

The camps were rendered necessary in our State because of the ability of those men to come quickly into the State and because they found there at times not the same rigors of climate that they had in the places from which they came. From every State in the Union over the line, during this terrible time, have they come. They have come in such numbers that it is estimated on actual count that about 1,200 a day have come during certain periods. Of these transients the best records have been kept that were available, and 20 per cent of them are under 21 years of age.

There has not been an instance of disorder, there has not been an instance of crime in the camps; and the work that has been done there has been well done, efficiently done, and has saved those who came within them.

Last October I saw in the photogravure section of the New York Times—a very great newspaper but for its editorial page [laughter]—pictures of itinerant boys who have gone about in this country, taken in East St. Louis. They were singularly instructive and remarkably appealing. Some of us are old enough to have grandchildren of the age of these boys. I can not imagine anything more tragic than for a parent to see those whom he loves and those for whom he can not provide going out upon the highways, little lads—that is all they are—and there hiking along, subjected to influences to which under ordinary circumstances they never would be subjected, misfortune being their only fault, the poverty of their parents their only crime. These lads, to the number of 300,000 or more, going about in this country, present an appealing subject for legislation by this body at the only time in this session it has had the opportunity to legislate for human beings at all.

Here are the pictures as described in this paper:

A tragic aftermath of the days of prosperity: The army of homeless boys now roaming the country.

Youthful victims of a calamity which has spread throughout the world: Boy wanderers, one of the many fitting groups from a pathetic army of more than a quarter of a million lads under 21, having dinner at a Salvation Army relief station in East St. Louis, Ill.

Look at those pictures! You can not look at them without a heart throb, and you can not look at them without feeling that if we can do anything in their behalf in this day it ought to be done; and here is the only mode presented to us. Not the best mode, perhaps; I grant you that. Not the only mode, perhaps; I grant you that. But it is the one mode that is before us now; and the Senator from Pennsylvania, with a generosity that does him infinite credit, says that he is willing this bill shall be amended so that these lads may be

taken care of either in the citizens' military training camps of the country or in the Army itself.

I do not care how we take care of them. I realize the objections that there are upon this floor to increasing the Army appropriations and the difficulty that the Senator from Michigan [Mr. COUZENS] will have in accomplishing that result. I realize what may be said about putting them in the citizens' military training camps, and I realize that those difficulties may be almost insuperable. But whether they are or whether they are not, let us try for some relief for these young men; and that many of the objections are merely fanciful I think the amendment that is presented here demonstrates beyond a doubt.

First, it is declared in this amendment that any person admitted to any military post pursuant to the provisions of paragraph 1 shall be subject to the customary discipline maintained at such post. Therefore you have him under discipline.

Secondly, you have the right in the Secretary of War, authorized directly by this amendment, to make such rules and regulations as he may deem necessary to carry out the provisions of this section. Under that provision he can make such rules and regulations as may be essential to protect the Regular Army, to prevent any of the ills that have been suggested here, and generally to execute and administer, in the fashion that we care to have it administered, this particular law.

Problem it is for the Army; but it is our problem, too. Problem it is for the commandant, as is suggested by the Senator from Pennsylvania—admitted; but it is our problem, too. The problem that is presented to-day to our legislative assembly here is whether we will do what lies in our power at the moment, in the only way that is suggested to us, to remedy an evil—an evil that none of us would tolerate in times of prosperity, and that is due solely to the economic crisis confronting us to-day.

So, let us act—act upon the only bill dealing with human misery and with want and suffering and hunger and destitution that has come before the Senate in this whole session. Let us act, and let us try even though we fail to provide a wholly adequate remedy.

Mr. CUTTING. Mr. President, as the sponsor of an alternative measure dealing with this problem, I desire to associate myself with the remarks just made by the Senator from California [Mr. JOHNSON].

The Senator perhaps is aware that the legislature of his own State unanimously indorsed the proposal which I introduced in the Senate dealing with this particular problem.

Everyone who has been a Member of this body for any length of time will realize that the easiest way to defeat any worthy cause is to induce the proponents of that cause to quarrel among themselves on questions of method.

The proposition which I have made is that the Federal Government should appropriate a sum of \$15,000,000 to be granted to the States, first, upon the showing of need, and, secondly, upon the showing that each State has a definite plan for dealing with the problem.

If these two proposals—the one made by the Senator from Michigan and the other which I have proposed—were on the floor of this body to be pitted against each other, I should be very glad to show, from the evidence of the witnesses who appeared before the subcommittee of the Committee on Manufactures, what I conceive to be the superior merits of my proposal. Some of them, I believe, were taken up to-day by the senior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LA FOLLETTE].

The main argument of these witnesses was that each one of these transient young men and young women—for there is a large number of itinerant young women whose problems are equally grave—constitutes an individual problem. They have to be handled as individuals. It is very difficult to treat them in such large units as would be necessary under the present proposal.

I think there is force in many of the objections made by the Senator from Pennsylvania; but I must say that when

the Senator from Pennsylvania proposes to have the problem handled through the citizens' military training camps he is simply, to my mind, adding to the difficulties before us.

The Senator from Pennsylvania has stated that by his plan it would cost \$22,000,000 to take care of 88,000 cases, a very small proportion of the total number of cases with which we are going to have to deal.

The proposal made by me, which is now a part of the Costigan-La Follette bill, and is on the Senate Calendar—and the same thing applies to the proposals embodied in the bill of the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER]—deals with the problem as a whole and not with any one special angle of it, and deals with that problem at very much less cost than has been suggested by the Senator from Pennsylvania.

I feel, furthermore, Mr. President, that the Army is not ideally suited to take care of a problem of this kind. We have seen in the past the difficulties involved in allowing the Army merely to present a course in American citizenship at these citizens' military training camps, and how unsatisfactory that has been in many ways. I do not think the Army can handle the problem. I do not think it can handle more than one small bit of the problem. But I do agree with the Senator from California that, when this is the only proposal before us, we ought to suspend the rules, give the Senator from Michigan a chance to bring his proposal on to the floor of the Senate, and then perhaps amend it so that it will be more satisfactory to the majority of the Senate membership.

Mr. President, as the question stands it is not a problem of one of two methods; it is a problem of getting the question before the Senate.

I can not add to the very graphic picture which the Senator from Michigan drew on Saturday of the conditions in the country. The problem is one of enormous magnitude. It can hardly be overstated. The statistics which have been furnished are not accurate, they are largely a matter of guesswork; but when we consider that the testimony of these expert witnesses placed the number of transients, at the minimum, at 800,000, and, at the maximum, in figures away up in the millions, we realize that the problem has to be handled in one way or another at this session of the Congress.

Mr. President, these transients are not members of the tramp or hobo class. Ninety per cent of them are the best of the youth of the country. By delaying we are developing the 90 per cent who started out with the intention of getting jobs into a generation of hoboes.

For that reason, Mr. President, I think we should sink any personal differences involved and vote to suspend the rules and bring the proposal of the Senator from Michigan onto the floor of the Senate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the motion of the senior Senator from Michigan [Mr. COUZENS] to suspend the rules.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. Mr. President, I think we should have a quorum present. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Ashurst	Cutting	Kendrick	Shipstead
Austin	Dale	Keyes	Shortridge
Balley	Davis	King	Smith
Bankhead	Dickinson	La Follette	Smoot
Barbour	Dill	Lewis	Stelwer
Barkley	Fess	Logan	Stephens
Bingham	Fletcher	McKellar	Swanson
Blaine	Frazier	McNary	Thomas, Idaho
Borah	George	Moses	Thomas, Okla.
Bratton	Glass	Neely	Townsend
Brookhart	Glenn	Norris	Trammell
Bulkeley	Goldsborough	Nye	Tydings
Bulow	Gore	Oddie	Vandenberg
Byrnes	Grammer	Patterson	Wagner
Capper	Hale	Pittman	Walcott
Caraway	Harrison	Reed	Walsh, Mass.
Clark	Hastings	Reynolds	Walsh, Mont.
Connally	Hatfield	Robinson, Ark.	Watson
Coolidge	Hayden	Robinson, Ind.	White
Copeland	Hull	Russell	
Costigan	Johnson	Schuyler	
Couzens	Kean	Sheppard	

Mr. CUTTING. I desire to announce that the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. NORBECK] is absent on official business.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Eighty-five Senators having answered to their names, there is a quorum present. The question is on the motion of the senior Senator from Michigan [Mr. COUZENS] to suspend the rules.

Mr. COUZENS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to lay the motion aside temporarily while I offer an amendment to the bill in the form of a substitute.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the Senator from Michigan is recognized.

Mr. COUZENS. Mr. President, I offer as an amendment, to overcome some of the objections which have been stated to my proposal, on page 59, line 12, to strike out "\$2,500,000" and to insert in lieu thereof—

Twenty-four million five hundred thousand dollars, of which \$22,000,000 shall be available only for camps of at least 12 months' duration in which applicants are accepted only if over 15 years and under 21 years of age, and if unemployed at the time of application and for six months previous thereto.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, I do not rise to object to this proposed amendment, but I would like to know what we can expect from the administration of the appropriation in the way of giving these boys something to do.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I did not hear the whole of the Senator's question.

Mr. BORAH. I should like to know what we may expect in the way of rules and regulations which will really give the boys something to do after they are taken into these camps. Of course, I would rather have them in the camps than out on the road, no matter what they were doing; but I think it is highly important that those who are to administer the appropriation have in mind that this body expects them to make the administration broad enough to give the boys something to do in the way of mental occupation, some activity that will enable them to improve themselves in that respect, as well as the physical training and discipline.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I think the best assurance that that will be the attitude of the Army is in the experience with the camps heretofore established. I have never heard any criticism from any parent of the course of study that was given in these citizens' military training camps. On the other hand, I have had many letters from fathers and mothers of these young men saying that their boys had been improved, that they had learned a great deal outside of the narrow military discipline and military tactics, and I think that the best evidence of what they will do is in what they have done.

I agree with the Senator that to take these young men in and spend 12 months teaching them how to do squads right would be a waste of time and Government money, and a waste of a great opportunity to better these youngsters in every way.

Mr. BORAH. Secondly, if these boys go into the camps, as would be permitted under the amendment, would they be held there in opposition to their wishes?

Mr. REED. Not at all. If one of them desires to go home for any reason, or if he finds employment, or has any other reason for leaving, he will be free to do so at any time.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the amendment?

There being no objection, the amendment was agreed to.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Michigan wish to withdraw his motion to suspend the rule?

Mr. COUZENS. I ask unanimous consent for leave to withdraw the motion to suspend the rule.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and without objection the motion to suspend the rule is withdrawn. The bill is still open to amendment.

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. President, I would like to ask the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. REED] whether any provision was made to take care of the situation in the library at West Point?

Mr. REED. Yes; an amendment was offered by the Senator from New York [Mr. COPELAND] to provide that a retired officer might be retained or engaged there as librarian.

Mr. BINGHAM. I thank the Senator.

Mr. FRAZIER. Mr. President, on page 60 of the bill, I move to strike out, beginning with line 11, the balance of that page, all of page 61, and down to and including line 9, on page 62. That means striking out the appropriation for the civilian instruction in rifle practice. The total amount, as I understand it, is \$188,215, in a way a trifling amount and yet a saving should be made in every way possible.

I will say that I had intended to move to strike out the citizens' military training camp appropriation, but inasmuch as an amendment has been adopted to include the plan of the Senator from Michigan [Mr. COUZENS] I shall be very glad to see that put into operation.

We are spending more money than should be spent for war purposes, in my estimation. I want to read a short article for the benefit of those present and also for the RECORD. It is under a release headline of January 6, 1933, being an authentic statement by Roger W. Babson, "How the Federal Budget Could Be Balanced," under date line of Washington, D. C., January 6, 1933. It is copyrighted 1933 by the Publishers Financial Bureau and reads as follows:

No one realizes more keenly than I the necessity for balancing the Federal Budget. The credit of the United States must and will be kept intact, because upon it rests the whole confidence of our financial and business structure. I do not, however, agree with the crazy methods advocated by the "econo-maniacs" of the National Economy League and similar organizations who are attacking earnest and conscientious employees engaged in necessary Government work. First of all, let me say that the real cost of government is not \$3,929,000,000 (as people say) but only \$678,098,000. This is demonstrated by analyzing the Budget for the fiscal year to end June 30, 1933.

WHERE THE TROUBLE REALLY LIES

The Federal Budget for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1933, is approximately \$3,929,000,000. This amount is divided as follows:

(1) Interest and sinking fund on public debt.....	\$1,136,700,000
(2) Cost of veterans, etc.....	928,000,000
(3) Cost of Army and Navy.....	648,300,000

Total.....	2,713,000,000
(4) Remaining expenses of entire United States Government.....	1,216,198,000

Of the \$1,216,198,000 remaining expenses there is a \$538,100,000 expenditure for public works, which can not be properly charged to regular operating costs of government. These public works are important unemployment relief measures. Deducting them from the total remaining costs:

Remaining expenses.....	\$1,216,198,000
Public works.....	538,100,000

678,098,000

This leaves only \$678,098,000 actual running expenses of Government departments, concerning which everybody is shouting "economy."

Mr. David Lawrence figures that the present tax on tobacco, cigars, and cigarettes will bring in \$500,000,000, which is three-fourths of the \$678,000,000 ordinary cost of running the Government. The customs duties are bringing in another \$290,000,000. In other words, the tobacco tax and customs duties alone would more than take care of the entire regular expense. Do you wonder that I decry the foolish talk about economy of Government and "technocracy of management"? The real trouble lies in three things: (1) Enormous interest and sinking-fund charges on Federal debt; (2) the cost of past wars; and (3) the preparation for future wars. Also, remember that the Federal debt is almost wholly the result of wars! That is where your heavy income and profits taxes, your estate taxes, your gasoline taxes, and all of the big taxes are going. That's where some people now propose to throw in a general sales tax.

WHAT CAN BE DONE ABOUT IT?

Now let us analyze these three big expense items: First, interest and sinking fund on debt, \$1,136,700,000. This can be cut only by defaulting on interest and sinking fund, or by revaluing gold, or by some conversion plan which would reduce interest charges. Something may be done along one or more of these lines, but how much can practically be done is a moot question. Second, cost of veterans' aid, \$928,000,000. Of course there may be inequalities and abuses in this matter. If so, they should be corrected. Yet how can cutting the veterans improve business? In most cases reducing Federal aid to veterans would result in increasing local aid to their families. Third, cost of the Army and Navy, \$648,300,000. This can be cut only through disarmament plans; but can we ever bring about disarmament by raising tariffs, fighting about debts, and making ourselves generally hated abroad? With

the present antiforeign attitude on the part of Congress we are headed for another world war instead of world peace.

This all means that the hullabaloo about "economy" is like a dog barking at the moon. It doesn't get us anywhere. It may be well to consider reduction of aid to veterans, but why not say so? Why beat about the bush and persecute honest, hard-working Federal employees, many of whom are habitually underpaid? Why is the Budget out of balance? Because of war. About \$3,000,000,000 of our \$4,000,000,000 Budget for 1933 goes to pay for past wars and to prepare for future wars. Hence our real job is to get behind the peace societies instead of economy leagues. Elimination of war is the only way the world can ever hope to balance its budgets. That must be the real aim, even though it requires time. Meanwhile, until we have a more unselfish world spirit the only sane and worthwhile way of balancing the Budget is to improve general business. This means increasing purchasing power. If the Federal Government would spend only 2 per cent of its Annual Budget on a sane publicity campaign to increase purchasing power from the ground up it would have no trouble balancing the Budget.

The last paragraph is one that I think will be agreed to and approved by a great many people:

CHRISTIANITY, NOT ECONOMY, NEEDED

In other words, there are two things necessary to balance the Budget and keep it balanced. The first is to start a great national advertising campaign, paid for by the Federal Government, to create a demand for goods and to bring business back to normal. This would have been impossible before now because the deflation was necessary, but now such a campaign would work. The second is to substitute international good will for war. Reduction in world budgets is awaiting a substitution of the Christ spirit of tolerance, good will, and righteousness in place of the present-day spirit of hate, nationalism, and selfishness. It's not economy nor technocracy the world needs to-day, but, rather, simple Christianity.

Business as registered by the Babson chart now stands at 15 per cent below a year ago.

Mr. President, that is a sentiment expressed by Roger W. Babson. He is supposed to be one of the best authorities we have in the country on business conditions and business interests. It is rather an amazing statement. According to his figures, approximately 20 per cent of the appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30 next, after we deduct the amount for public works, go for the actual running expenses of the Government. The 80 per cent is for war purposes—past, present, and future. We have been working here for days and days trying to cut the 20 per cent of actual expenses of running the Government. When it comes to the War Department bill, it is true there is a little cut under last year's appropriation, but nothing like a sufficiently large reduction. In fact, the Senate Committee on Appropriations has increased the amount as carried in the bill as it passed the House by about \$1,660,000.

Mr. FESS. Mr. President, may I suggest that we just now added \$22,000,000 more?

Mr. FRAZIER. Yes; that is true. In my opinion, the last addition may bring about some good results in relieving the present deplorable unemployment situation. But there are many other items in the bill which in my opinion are not only absolutely useless, but the money is practically wasted, and wasted at a time when there is great need for curtailment of expenses and great need for money being expended for other purposes.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD, as a part of my remarks, a statement from the New York Times of February 6 of this year headed "Five Peace Groups Join at Philadelphia in Plea to Instruct Geneva Delegates." It is in reference to a letter to President Hoover from the five peace groups.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, that order will be made.

The statement is as follows:

[From the New York Times, February 6, 1933]

ASK HOOVER MOVE TO DISARM WORLD—FIVE PEACE GROUPS JOIN AT PHILADELPHIA IN PLEA TO INSTRUCT GENEVA DELEGATES

PHILADELPHIA, Pa., February 5.—President Hoover is asked to instruct the American delegates to the Geneva conference "to propose a multilateral treaty for immediate total disarmament" in a joint message sent to him to-day by five peace organizations and made public here by the Pennsylvania Committee for Total Disarmament.

Pointing out that the present Geneva conference, like its predecessors, aims "only to limit, not to eliminate, warfare," the message warns that such efforts "are foredoomed to fail."

"The bridge," it says, "must be built not half way but all the way across the abyss of war."

The signers of the message, in behalf of their organizations, are Dr. William I. Hull, chairman of the Pennsylvania Committee for Total Disarmament; Mildred S. Olmsted of the National Board, Women's International League for Peace and Freedom, United States section; John Nevin Sayre, executive secretary of the Fellowship of Reconciliation; Anne E. Gray, director of the Women's Peace Society; and Mary B. Orr, director of the Women's Peace Union of New York.

The statement reads, in part, as follows:

"On February 6, 1932, a great petition for total world disarmament, signed by millions of men and women in many countries, was presented to the disarmament conference in Geneva.

"A year has passed. These petitioners, with other millions all over the world who demand from their governments international disarmament and peace, have watched the long sessions of the Geneva conference, and with profound disappointment have seen its failure so far to achieve any degree of actual disarmament. Four conferences for the reduction of armaments have been held in the last 10 years. These conferences failed even to stop the growth of world armaments.

"Vigorous effort and leadership must break the strangle hold of national armaments, the international traffic in arms, and armed alliances which are making for war. Four precious weeks of office remain to you. The solution can not be delayed.

"Mr. President, we ask you now to instruct your delegates at the Geneva conference to propose a multilateral treaty for immediate total disarmament. Proposed by the United States, such a treaty would revivify the conference and be an invitation which governments would find it hard to disregard in the face of worldwide unrest."

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from North Dakota has one minute remaining on the amendment.

Mr. FRAZIER. Very well; I will continue on the bill.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator is recognized for 15 minutes on the bill.

Mr. FRAZIER. From a report of Gen. Douglas A. MacArthur, Chief of Staff of the War Department, I want to quote a brief paragraph, as follows:

To sum up, governmentally we have to-day, from the standpoint of national strategy and policy, the strongest possible organization for war. It seems almost incomprehensible that this organization, which incidentally has been the envy of soldiers, sailors, and statesmen abroad, should be tampered with in the major elements in favor of a highly speculative experiment.

That is a quotation from Gen. Douglas A. MacArthur admitting that we have the largest war-purpose forces we have ever had in peace times. Although we talk about world peace and disarmament, yet we have the largest preparations for war that we have ever had in peace times in both the Army and the Navy.

I have an editorial which was published in the Brisbane column of the Washington Herald of February 9 last, which I desire to read, as it is along the same line:

Stalin, in Russia, drafts tens of thousands from the cities, peasants from farms, sends them into the cold Arctic to cut trees and provide lumber that the second 5-year plan calls for. Our "best minds" shake their heavy heads and say, "How horrible, to force tens of thousands of men to cut down trees in Arctic weather."

They didn't shake their heads when our Government forced 3,000,000 men to go to Europe into a quarrel not our own. To stand around in trenches is less pleasant than cutting wood in cold weather.

Stalin's men cutting wood will produce wealth.

Our men were gassed, some of them shot, and the bill in pensions, bonus insurance, and hospitalization, involved in their enforced absence abroad, their heroism, and patriotism, will cost taxpayers of the United States \$50,000,000,000 before the bill is all paid.

Some countries are more foolish than Russia, and some kinds of stupidity worse than drafting men to cut lumber.

Mr. LEWIS. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from North Dakota yield to the Senator from Illinois?

Mr. FRAZIER. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. LEWIS. Will the able Senator from North Dakota let me interrogate him upon a matter for information?

Mr. FRAZIER. Certainly.

Mr. LEWIS. Recognizing the Senator as an authority upon all questions affecting agriculture and particularly the needs of the farmers of the Northwest I should like to ask the Senator this question: Under the amendment by the Senator from Michigan [Mr. COUZENS] and adopted in the sense which we understand it to have been adopted, provid-

ing for the care in Army camps of a vast number of young men who may be found here and there unemployed, does the Senator from North Dakota feel that that will draw men from the farms of the Northwest? Will they leave the farms and their cultivation in order to avail themselves of the privilege accorded under that amendment, and go to the Army posts and camps there to live and leave their work upon the farms?

Mr. FRAZIER. Mr. President, I should not say that that would be the effect at all; I do not feel the amendment, if enacted into law, will have that effect. As a matter of fact, at the present time there is not very much farm employment; the farmers can not afford to hire anyone; they can not get enough money for their products to enable them to pay their running expenses, let alone hiring help; and so they themselves are doing what work they can and are not hiring men. The amendment, if it shall finally become effective, may take some of the young men from cities who normally would go to the farm and work there during their vacations during the summer, but I do not believe it will take very many, and practically none, from the farms themselves.

Mr. LEWIS. Let me, Mr. President, anticipate. In the Senator's judgment, will the sons of the owners of the farms, members of farmers' families, remain on the farm to do farming work, with this opportunity afforded, or will they leave their households and their homes to live at Army posts and camps under the provisions of the amendment referred to?

Mr. FRAZIER. Of course, there are a few of the farm boys who now go to citizens' military training camps just as a summer vacation, and I presume more may go under the provision referred to than have gone in the past; but I do not know about that.

Mr. LEWIS. What would the Senator say, Mr. President, would be the effect upon the farm work in getting out the crops if those who are members of farm families should leave the farm and enter Army camps as suggested? How does the Senator think that would affect the planting and harvesting of crops among those who are so poor as not to be able to employ outside help?

Mr. FRAZIER. We have an oversupply of farm products, anyway, and if it is cut down, according to economists, it will relieve the situation so that perhaps the farmers may get better prices for their products. However, I am not worrying about the lack of workers on the farms, even if farm work shall be neglected and the quantity of commodities produced cut down.

Mr. LEWIS. I thank the Senator for his suggestion.

Mr. FRAZIER. Mr. President, in my opinion an amazing situation confronts the Congress. As I have stated from the Babson article, only 20 per cent of the money actually expended this year for governmental purposes of all kinds goes for the actual ordinary running expenses of the Government. If that 20 per cent could all be wiped out entirely, our present revenue would not be sufficient to pay the balance of the 80 per cent expended for war purposes past, present, and future, and for the deficit that now exists. I repeat, we have an amazing situation confronting us. I do not know what the outcome is going to be. We have millions out of employment; we have farmers by the thousands going broke and out of business. We have read in the newspapers during the last few days about farmers organizing throughout the country to prevent themselves and their neighbors from losing their farms and their property by foreclosure sales. I have a clipping here from the Washington News of February 9, which shows a picture taken in the great old State of Ohio. Under the picture is the following statement:

Three thousand of Ohio's militant penny-bidding farmers burned communist literature, unfurled the American flag, hung up two nooses in a barn, and paid \$1.90 for a neighbor's chattels that were mortgaged for \$800. Here is a part of the crowd saluting the flag after chasing communists away. The two tractors in the background were bid in for 17 cents. The Ohioans returned his goods to Walter Crozier, Haskins farmer, defeating another foreclosure.

That occurred in the old, conservative, sane, and sensible State of Ohio. In the newspaper there is another story right under it:

Farmers hold United States official and force mortgage action.

This incident happened in the great old State of Michigan. The dispatch is dated Ithaca, Mich., and reads:

ITHACA, MICH.—A crowd of 1,000 angry farmers held a Federal official prisoner near here late yesterday while they were bidding \$3.80 for the mortgaged livestock and farm tools of Roy Marzolf.

The farmers seized Peter A. Holman, 40, United States Treasury official and receiver of the defunct Ithaca National Bank, holder of the mortgage, when he arrived on the Marzolf farm 3 miles from Ithaca.

After the sale they compelled him to accept the \$3.80 and sign a release of the \$9,000 mortgage. When Holman informed them the mortgage note was in the bank the farmers forced A. A. Borsum, clerk, to get it from the vault and turned it over to Marzolf.

Sheriff Jacob D. Helman, of Gratiot County, an auctioneer himself, started the sale with the announcement he had a sealed bid of \$400 from George Davis, auto dealer. Davis withdrew the bid when the irate farmers threatened to boycott him.

Attempting to sell the property separately, the sheriff asked for \$10 to start the bidding on a grain binder. A farmer bid 2 cents. Holman announced the sale would be postponed 10 days. The farmers countered by seizing Holman, who was in the crowd.

Resuming his rôle as auctioneer, the sheriff accepted bids of 15 cents for the binder, 20 cents for an auto, and 25 cents for a cow. One farmer bought a wagon for 10 cents.

Holman said to-day he is reporting the attack on his person to the United States Comptroller of Currency in Washington. He will await a reply, he said, before taking action against the farmers.

That incident occurred in the great old State of Michigan.

Mr. COUZENS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from North Dakota yield to the Senator from Michigan?

Mr. FRAZIER. I yield.

Mr. COUZENS. I could tell the Senator worse stories than that about conditions in the State of Michigan.

Mr. FRAZIER. That one is bad enough.

Mr. COUZENS. And I assume the Senator from North Dakota could likewise tell some pretty bad ones about conditions in his State.

Mr. FRAZIER. This one is bad enough. So it seems that even in States like Michigan and Ohio farmers are organizing and taking the law in their own hands to prevent the sale of their mortgaged property. After all, Mr. President, self-preservation is the first law of nature, and always has been, and these farmers are taking the law in their own hands to prevent the loss of their property.

There is a rather encouraging note in this situation, and that is that when the American farmers become sufficiently well organized they are going to have power enough, in my opinion, to demand from the United States Congress the legislation they want, and to get it, too. They are the people who produce the food with which to feed the Nation; they control the very lifeblood of this Nation, and when they become well organized they will bring about a change.

Mr. President, the expenditures for military purposes should be reduced. I hope that the few thousand dollars proposed to be appropriated for civilian training in rifle practice may be cut out of this bill and that the amount may be saved. There are numerous other items that should be cut out of the bill, that might be cut out just as well as not, in my opinion; but I am not going further to take up the time of the Senate. I trust, however, that the amendment which I have offered may be adopted.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. FRAZIER].

PAYMENT IN SILVER OF NEXT BRITISH DEBT INSTALLMENT

Mr. PITTMAN. Mr. President, I propose by a bill which I shall introduce to-day to make it possible for Great Britain to pay in silver its interest installment amounting to \$74,950,000 due the United States June 15, 1933.

The bill authorizes the President to accept from Great Britain silver not to exceed \$100,000,000 in value at the market price of silver at the time of acceptance as a payment upon the British war debt.

The Government of India owes Great Britain approximately \$85,000,000. It has been reported with some authority that the Government of India is desirous of paying this debt to Great Britain with silver. The acceptance by the United States of \$74,950,000 worth of silver at the world market price of silver of approximately 25 cents an ounce, which is probably lower than it ever will be again, would not only be profitable to the United States but advantageous both to the United States and Great Britain.

Under such a settlement the United States would receive 299,800,000 ounces of silver at the present market price of around 25 cents an ounce. Under the provisions of the bill our Government out of such silver would coin 74,950,000 standard silver dollars. It would deposit such standard silver dollars in the Treasury, and issue and circulate against them \$74,950,000 in silver certificates similar to those now in circulation in the United States.

As it requires only seventy-eight one-hundredths of an ounce of silver in the coinage of standard silver dollars, there would remain therefore in the Treasury, in addition to such 74,950,000 standard silver dollars, 241,339,000 ounces of silver to be held in the Treasury as additional security for the maintenance of a parity of the silver certificates so issued.

The issuance of \$74,950,000 in silver certificates would not overbalance our silver currency as against our gold currency in circulation. In fact, even with this addition, our silver currency in circulation in the United States would be proportionately less to gold than it was in 1913. There has not been in this century any threat of depreciation of our silver currency, although during all that time, except for the years 1920-1923 when silver currency was temporarily reduced by sales to India, there has been in circulation in the United States silver currency in the form of silver certificates, standard silver dollars and subsidiary coinage in amounts varying from \$648,000,000 in 1900 to \$850,000,000 in 1930. The only addition to our silver currency during the present century has come through subsidiary coinage.

The currency so issued would be in no sense fiat money, as there would be supporting it a sufficient amount of silver to insure at all times the intrinsic value of the silver certificates issued, while at the same time it would meet to a certain extent the growing demand in this country for an expansion of currency circulation available for our domestic trade.

The consummation of the plan proposed in the bill would relieve Great Britain from a further burden upon her gold reserves in the payment of her interest installment on June 15 and at the same time relieve her credit situation pending results of intergovernmental conversations and the coming international economic conference.

It would also enable the Government of India to carry out its fixed policy of disposing of three or four hundred million ounces of its Government silver without further pursuing the practice of dumping such alleged oversupply of Indian silver upon the markets of the world, which has been and is now so destructive of the exchange value in international trade of silver currencies throughout the world. There is little doubt, from the statement made by the Government of India, that with the disposal of such an amount of silver the practice put in effect by the Government of India, based upon the policy of 1926 of melting up Indian silver coins and selling the silver derived therefrom on the markets of the world, would be abandoned.

The bill requires, as a condition of the acceptance of such silver by the United States, that the Governments of Great Britain and India shall agree not to debase or melt up silver coins for a period of five years. As India is now practically the only country pursuing the policy of debasing and melting up silver coins, the abandonment of such policy by India would restore the price of silver, as the market would then be based on normal mine production and normal demand.

The return to normal mine supply and normal demand would undoubtedly restore the price of silver to between 60 and 70 cents an ounce, where it remained stable for many

years, and thus raise and stabilize the exchange value of silver money in international trade.

May I at this point, for the benefit of some of our citizens who are not familiar with the definition of the terms, state what I mean by the "exchange value of money or currencies in international trade"? The exchange value of all currencies in international trade is measured by the amount of gold for which such currencies may be exchanged. Our country, for instance, is on the gold standard. Our dollar may be exchanged for so many grains of gold. When the currency of another government can not be exchanged for as much gold as called for under the terms of issue we term that currency "depreciated," although it may circulate at its nominal or par value in the country of issue.

Returning to the question of the value of the silver proposed to be accepted: It is true that the demand for silver has to a certain extent decreased, owing to the debasement and melting up of silver coins, and also to the stagnation of international trade. Yet, on the other hand, the stagnation in trade, particularly in respect to copper, lead, and zinc, has decreased mine production of silver throughout the world from 261,511,985 ounces in 1929 to 160,000,000 ounces in 1932. The reason for this is readily understood when we are informed that 70 per cent of the silver produced in the world is a by-product of the mining of such metals. This natural fact provides an automatic control of the mine production of silver.

While there are probably 12,000,000,000 ounces of silver in existence, it was estimated by Mr. Francis H. Brownell, chairman of the board of directors of the American Smelting & Refining Co., at a recent hearing before the Committee on Coinage, Weights, and Measures of the House of Representatives, that a substantial rise in the price of silver would not bring into the markets in excess of 350,000,000 ounces of silver. The reasons for this estimate were very definitely given by Mr. Brownell, whose company has been buying and selling silver in all parts of the world for over 30 years.

While there are probably 12,000,000,000 ounces of silver in existence, it must be remembered that most of this silver has been hoarded by the people of China and India throughout the ages. They do not acquire and hold it for the purpose of speculation. They give their labor and products for it, and they hold it as long as possible as the most valuable of all things and as the measure and reservoir of their wealth. The people of these countries have always purchased, and are even now purchasing, two-thirds of all the silver produced. While the Government for India was selling silver, the people of India were buying it. The rise and fall of the price of silver has had little effect upon this habit of the people of India and China. For instance, in 1920, when silver was selling in the world's markets at \$1.38 an ounce, which is above the parity price of silver with gold in our own country, and in fact in all countries, the people of China and India were not selling silver, but were buying more than their customary quantities.

Our bankers and business men, and in fact our citizens generally, have commenced to understand the destructive effect upon our trade and commerce of the depreciation of the exchange value of the currencies of those countries that have gone off the gold standard. They do not seem to realize, however, that the silver currencies of China and of other countries, embracing over half of the people of the world, have depreciated 56 per cent since 1928. They do not seem to realize that this depreciation in the exchange value of such silver currencies is due to the depreciation of the price of silver.

In 1928 China could exchange two of her silver dollars for one of our dollars with which to purchase our products. To-day she must exchange five of her silver dollars for one of our gold dollars with which to buy our products. In December, 1928, the low price of silver was 57.5 cents an ounce. At the present time it is around 25 cents an ounce.

The effect on our exports to China since 1928 is definitely disclosed in the report of the Department of Commerce issued February 11 of this year. The report says:

Compared with 1929, total imports showed a slump of 75 per cent, and exports 60 per cent, while they were 34 and 43 per cent, respectively, below the average imports and exports for the years 1915 and 1919, inclusive.

The report further says:

This decline shows the effects of prevailing economic conditions at home and abroad, of fluctuating exchange rates, and the reduced purchasing power of the masses in most oriental countries.

The statement "reduced purchasing power of the masses in most oriental countries" means, of course, purchasing power abroad—that is, purchasing power in countries of a higher money standard, such as ours, because the purchasing power of the masses of the orientals in their own countries has remained practically unchanged. In other words, a Chinaman receives the same amount of money for a day's labor or for his products to-day as he received in 1929. He buys as much in his own country with his money to-day as he could buy in 1929. It is only when he buys in foreign countries where the value of his money is measured by gold that his purchasing power has decreased.

We have suffered since 1928 from the depreciation of the silver currencies of China and other silver-using countries. We have suffered only since September, 1931, from the depreciation of currencies of other governments that were formerly on the gold standard. We will probably find it quite difficult to discover means to aid in the restoration of the depreciated currencies of those governments that went off the gold standard; but it is obvious to me that it will be quite simple for our Government successfully to aid in the restoration of the depreciated currencies of China and other silver-using countries.

The restoration of the exchange value of such currencies will restore our normal trade with those countries and greatly accelerate its increase. I need cite but one illustration in support of this assertion. It will be remembered that in November of 1931 silver suddenly rose in price from 26 cents an ounce to 36 cents an ounce in response to a general belief that our Government intended to take steps to restore the price of silver. As no action was taken by our Government, the price of silver immediately fell. Here is what the Department of Commerce says with regard to that incident. I quote from page 29 of the China Monthly Trade Report for December, 1931, issued by our Department of Commerce, as follows:

The rapid rise in the price of silver during the earlier part of November brought the price in American raw cotton in local currency to still lower levels than it was previously and resulted in large sales of the American staple. Arrivals during the month are estimated to be larger than any previous month, and importers state that December arrivals will be still greater. Many Chinese mills are reported to have purchased or contracted stocks sufficient to last them for many months in the future. In certain instances it is believed that stocks sufficient for two years operations have been contracted.

What the statement says with regard to "bringing to lower levels" does not mean that the price of cotton actually fell to lower levels, but that it was lower to the Chinese by reason of the increase in the exchange value of their currency.

It will also be observed that the Chinese, anticipating a rising market, laid in supplies of our product to meet their needs for many months. This, to my mind, and in the opinion of experts with whom I have conferred, leads to the conclusion that any action by our Government tending toward the restoration of the exchange value of silver currencies will start immediately large purchases in our country by peoples using silver currencies.

I call attention to the fact that this bill, like the bill heretofore introduced by me for the purchase of American silver at the market price of silver with silver certificates, approved by the Banking and Currency Committee and now pending in the Senate, will in no way disturb our gold standard system, while accomplishing the restoration of the exchange value of the money of our customers in silver-using countries.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent at this point to introduce the bill which I have described, and ask that it

may be printed in the RECORD as a part of my remarks and referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, that order will be made.

The bill (S. 5636) to authorize payment of foreign debts in silver under certain limitations, was read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the President of the United States is authorized to accept silver in amounts not to exceed in value in United States currency \$100,000,000 in payment of the whole or any part of any amount of principal or interest due from Great Britain or her dominions or dependencies on account of any indebtedness to our Government, such silver to be accepted at the market price in the United States as determined by the United States Treasury Department as of the date when the President shall notify such foreign government of such acceptance: *Provided—*

(a) That such market price shall not at the time of such acceptance exceed the price of 45 cents an ounce, and (b) that such foreign government so making such tender shall, before the acceptance thereof by the President as herein authorized, agree and bind itself in a manner satisfactory to the President not to debase or melt up its own silver coins or permit the debasement or melting up of such silver coins except for the purpose of re-coining by such government or its dominions or dependencies for their circulation, during a period of five years from and after the acceptance by the President of such silver.

(c) That the authority of the President to accept silver as herein authorized shall be limited to a period of not to exceed five years from the passage of this act.

SEC. 2. The silver bullion purchased under the provisions of this act shall be subject to the requirements of existing law and the regulations of the mint service governing the methods of determining the amount of pure silver contained, and the amount of the charges or deductions, if any, to be made; but such silver bullion shall not be counted as part of the silver bullion authorized or required to be purchased and coined under the provisions of existing law.

SEC. 3. The silver accepted and received under the provisions of this act shall be deposited in the Treasury of the United States, to be held, used, and disposed of as in this act provided.

SEC. 4. The President shall cause silver certificates to be issued in denominations of \$1, to the total number of dollars for which such silver was accepted in payment of debts. Such silver certificates shall be used by the Treasurer of the United States in payment of any obligations of the United States.

SEC. 5. The silver so accepted under this act shall be coined into standard silver dollars and subsidiary coins sufficient, in the opinion of the Secretary of the Treasury, to meet any demands for redemption of such silver certificates issued under the provisions of this act, and such coin shall be retained in the Treasury for the payment of such certificates on demand. The silver so obtained and deposited under this act, except so much thereof as is coined under the provisions of this act, shall be held in the Treasury for the sole purpose of aiding in maintaining the parity of such certificates as provided in existing law. Any such certificates or issued certificates, when presented at the Treasury, shall be redeemed in standard silver dollars, or in subsidiary silver coin, at the option of the holder of the certificates: *Provided, That,* in the redemption of such silver certificates issued under this act, not to exceed one-third of the coin required for such redemption may in the judgment of the Secretary of the Treasury be made in subsidiary coins, the balance to be made in standard silver dollars.

SEC. 6. When any silver certificates issued under the provisions of this act are redeemed or received into the Treasury from any source whatsoever, and belong to the United States, they shall not be retired, canceled, or destroyed, but shall be reissued and paid out again and kept in circulation; but nothing herein shall prevent the cancellation and destruction of mutilated certificates and the issue of other certificates of like denomination in their stead, as provided by law.

SEC. 7. The Secretary of the Treasury is authorized to make rules and regulations for carrying out the provisions of this act.

During the delivery of Mr. PITTMAN's speech—

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator's time has expired, but he has 15 minutes on the bill.

Mr. PITTMAN. I thank the Chair.

After the conclusion of Mr. PITTMAN's speech—

WAR DEPARTMENT APPROPRIATIONS

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 14199) making appropriations for the military and nonmilitary activities of the War Department for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1934, and for other purposes.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, in support of and justification for the compromise just agreed to, I desire to call the attention of the Senate to a news item appearing in to-day's New York Times. This is on the first page. It is under the heading:

Danger of revolt cited by farmers in pleas for relief. Letters to Senators tell fear of chaos unless "unbearable" burden is eased soon. Inflation demands grow. Idea that this is salvation mingles with call for debt moratorium. "Suffering amid plenty." Some denounce eastern bankers and Congress—Urge for a "new deal" is insistent.

This story evidently has been prepared by Mr. Russell Owen. It is a special dispatch; and I ask unanimous consent that the article under the heading as indicated may be printed in connection with my remarks.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, that order will be made.

The matter referred to is as follows:

[From the New York Times of Monday, February 13, 1933]

WASHINGTON, February 12.—The demands for inflation, mortgage moratoriums, and reduced taxes, which have been made in Congress in recent weeks, have their strongest roots in the middle and far western regions of the country. There is probably no more accurate mirror of the people's thought than mail received by Congressmen, and in the last two or three months the tone of these letters has changed radically.

From being argumentative, suggestive, and full of mildly phrased panaceas for national ills, they have become violent, denunciatory, and more often pathetic in the picture they sketch of conditions in the agricultural sections of the United States.

In an effort to learn just what farmers and those associated with them are thinking, to learn what causes these ordinarily law-abiding people to resort to extra-legal methods to prevent tax sales and mortgage foreclosures, hundreds of letters to several western Senators have been read. They have been taken at random from the mail of the last few months. They are from men who are not normally radical in their viewpoint—from formerly prosperous farmers, small-town bankers, lawyers, real-estate men, insurance agents, heads of mortgage and loan companies, and merchants. Most of those selected were typewritten on business letterheads.

A few months ago there was in the minds of the people who wrote these letters only a sad bewilderment at the financial swamp in which they were sinking, appeals for help, and angry protests. But now the predominant emotion in them is fear—fear of greater economic and business chaos, fear of revolution. That word was seldom used until two or three months ago; now it bobs up repeatedly in letters from the western farming communities. It is not a threat, but a specter which they have conjured up and from which they shrink. They fear trouble, fear revolt, but seldom threaten it.

CURRENCY INFLATION DEMANDED

The most insistent demand found in these letters is for currency inflation. The writers do not care much what kind of inflation, whether a reduction in the gold content of the dollar, free silver, bimetallism, or straight inflation of the currency. They don't particularly care what happens to industry and to the wage earner as the result of inflation. They want something with which to pay their debts, for they see themselves as a people living in the midst of plenty but with absolutely no money to meet their bills.

The idea that inflation may save the farmer has spread with startling rapidity in the last two months. It is advocated from Indiana, where it has most recently appeared as an issue which must be considered, all the way to the Pacific. One Senator went so far as to say that he did not believe any man could be elected west of the Mississippi in the next election unless he were for inflation.

The pressure of taxes, taxes which they can not meet, and which take from them their farms and homes, is also uppermost in their minds. They demand economy, demand that the ever-growing burden of taxation be lifted from them; and if inflation will help, so much the better. Government abuses which have crept into the administration of the farm loans, the lack of discretion which permits a land bank to exact the last dollar from a farmer who needs it for his spring planting, have aroused tremendous indignation among the western people.

BELIEVED CONGRESS SHOULD ACT

Anger at Congress for its do-nothing attitude, and past fumbling of the farm problem, is mingled with a fear that any remedy which may now be evolved will come too late to relieve the situation. There are suggestions that distribution of wealth should be forced by Congress, that eastern bankers should be made to "disgorge" the gold which the farmer believes has been hoarded. It was this feeling which reacted against the branch banking provision of the Glass bill, for the farmers believe that branch banks would merely aggravate their troubles and withdraw more money—if that were possible—from the agricultural communities.

They are violently opposed to cancellation of international debts, due to the conviction that the United States has been more solicitous of her foreign creditors than of the farmers and small business men. The farmer points out that he has been facing the depression for 10 years, that he was the original victim of inflation for the benefit of industry. There was no heed paid to his demands for relief so long as industry was booming, the westerner argues, and now he does not see why anyone should balk at inflation, which would help him, even if the rest of the country suffered. A small part of the money loaned abroad would immediately rehabilitate agriculture and restore its buying power, he says, and he thinks it is the duty of Congress to give it to him.

If relief is not forthcoming, writes one man, the bonus expeditionary force will look like a "sideshow" compared with the farmers' march on Washington.

LETTER ABOUT CANCELLATION

The attitude toward cancellation is shown in this letter from a lawyer in South Dakota:

"If you want real heat just mention cancellation of the debts owing our Government by European countries. The ordinary farmer doesn't know much about financing as conducted by international bankers, but he does know what it means to pay debts, and if anybody owes the American Government anything he wants it paid, the same as he has to pay. The average fellow in this country [meaning South Dakota] thinks we have already given too much. If capacity to pay is any measure, the farmers feel they ought to have the same chance as foreign governments and not lose most of their hide in the process.

"There has got to be a change for the better soon, or an awful lot of people will be ready to scrap the Constitution and everything else. A hungry belly hasn't much conscience and no pride in the existing order of things. You can't argue economics, supply and demand, world markets, and such like with a fellow who is hungry and is willing to work to supply his hunger and be unable to get the job. The same holds true with the farmer who has sweat for years to get somewhere, and then have it all change to chaff.

"HUEY LONG says we are headed for the bow-wows if we don't wake up and do something about it. It hasn't been so long ago that I would have been with the majority and scoffed at his statements, but now I am not so sure. I honestly believe that if some tangible target was offered to the people of this country they would be a bunch of raging wolves out for blood. If there is anything to this alleged concentration of wealth and bossing of the Government by and for the advantage and privilege of a few, Heaven protect and be ready to receive them when the rank and file come to fully realize it, and that goes for whoever is President and whatever party is in control.

SUGGESTS NEW DEAL ALL AROUND

"Better to tumble the whole economic structure into chaos and then oblivion and start from the ground up on a new deal all around than to continue the way we have been going. This may sound awful extreme, radical, and bolshevik, but is what is going on in the minds of tens of thousands of our people over the country, if what our own people say is any measure at all."

That letter represents the great majority, but there are contrasting expressions, which show a courage and fortitude which explains why events have been no worse in the Western States. Take this man, for instance, who has a few dollars left:

"Inclosed find the second \$50 payment on my loan. I very much thank you for your personal interest in me. I was surprised land banks were so human; and believe me, I won't fail to tell my friends what real men you are. I think lots of things would be better if we knew each other better and had a chance at the other fellow's point of view. And it surely is right that all we farmers need is a price for what we have to sell. But land knows when we will ever get that again. So we must just plug along together as well as we can and take the longer way up the hill, and we'll make it. Surely our forefathers handed us down that much grit."

To a bank: "I am going to let you foreclose on the farm, as I do not have any way of raising the money to meet the payments and taxes. I thought maybe the bank with the second would try and carry me over until I could realize something out of the crop, but they have not done so. With two short crops in 1930 and 1931, where I had to use other money to keep up on the payments and the taxes, and you getting this crop, which will not make the payments at present prices.

"I am not laying down on the payments or the crop on account of hard feeling toward you, but because I am unable to do otherwise. I know what condition you are in."

WRITERS TELL OF STRAITS

But letters like the last two are relatively few. Most of them read as do the following, written by men in various walks of life:

Real-estate man: "You know I am not an alarmist, but conditions are growing worse and there would be desperation now if it was not for the hope held out for relief. I seldom write, but I can see and feel a real uprising if the prices of farm and ranch products are not advanced. It looks as if many of our lawmakers want to continue 'fiddling while Rome burns,' [a phrase often used]."

Real-estate man: "The increase in our circulating medium is the greatest necessity for our recovery from the pitiable condition in which producers of every class find themselves at this time. We have all the minerals, farm products, raw material of every kind, and labor in abundance, but lack of necessary medium of exchange to make the country prosperous. I trust you will continue to battle for an adequate increase in the currency and banking system that does not take away from the local communities and place in the hands of giant institutions the control of the local banks."

Lawyer: "We feel that the only way that times can be helped is to put more money in circulation, and when that is done I am sure that the present condition will be much relieved. It seems as though we have everything else that we had in prosperous times except money, and the price of a dollar has been raised so much that the commodities the people have to sell and the property will have to be sacrificed to realize anything on them."

Banker: "Next in importance is the inflation of the currency. The importance of this is being strikingly manifested in different localities all over the country, where communities are issuing their own 'wooden money' and using it as a medium of barter and exchange. A continuation and an increase of foreclosures is going to lead to trouble, and it might become more serious than any of us would like to see. These farmers are not willingly going to give up their homes under these conditions."

BURDENS CALLED UNBEARABLE

Lawyer: "The people can not bear their burdens, and they will not bear them in peace. The American citizen is not going to work 365 days a year for many more years and give every dime of the proceeds of that labor to support his State and Federal Government, leaving nothing for himself and his family. I am writing this letter as a red-light signal to let you know there is danger ahead, and it is so close that it really makes me tremble. Any man in the United States at this time who will hold out for his own selfish motives and personal gain is the greatest traitor who lives in this country. This letter is written for the sake of America and American citizens, for the sake of my two children who come after me, and for the sake of common justice and right to mankind."

Small business man: "Our so-called banking system is a high-powered machine gun wherewith legalized robbers collect at regular intervals twice the value of their loans. Gold as money is almost as obsolete as wampum. Eggs, butter, clothing, steel, and a thousand other commodities lie useless because Eastern bankers are hoarding gold or its equivalent. Think of it—a people hungry and ill clad, surrounded by good things to eat and warm clothing to wear which they can not buy because some human parasites have been hiding gold. How long shall we trust our well-being to a commodity that's so scarce it rises in value every time some of it is taken out of circulation? You are right. 'If not reflation, then revolution.' I see no immediate relief for industry. If the farmers of this country can not be saved, God help America. Our money problem can only be solved by clear thinking; but if home owners lose their stake in America, it will be hard to convince hungry men that hot lead won't help."

Storekeeper: "It is imperative that politics be laid aside, that ability and judgment be used to solve the grave problems now confronting the American people. The uncertainty is creating unrest, making people lose faith in their representatives and in their Government. This should not be allowed to gain any momentum, for there is no telling where it will end, should a Hitler rise up and say, 'Let's go to Washington a million strong; make the rich divide with the starving poor.'"

INSTANCES OF DISTRESS

Here is the sort of thing which brings about letters such as the above:

Farmer: "My father came to Dakotas in 1873. In 1882 I homesteaded, married, and reared four children. We managed to give them all a good education. When the World War came on I was asked to buy Liberty bonds, which I did. I had no ready cash and so borrowed \$2,500 and gave a mortgage on a half section of land. I paid 9 per cent interest and received only 4 per cent from my Government bonds. In 1922, after years of sacrifice and hard work, mother and I retired. We sold the homestead and built us a modern home. We had 800 acres of good farm land, 61 shares of stock in the State bank, and had a nice income each year.

"But in 1931 the crops were short and the prices low; in 1932 the prices were still lower. We were obliged to borrow \$350 from the bank. I have been looking for a loan on the same half section that I mortgaged in 1917 and paid off in 1922. I have 800 acres of good North Dakota farm land, about \$8,000 in bank stock, notes for about \$2,500. My only indebtedness is the note for \$350 above referred to. All of our property will have to be sold for taxes unless we get help."

Farmer: "Now, our original loan was \$9,500, \$500 of which was stock. We are behind on our interest and taxes approximately \$1,600. But we have given them all the crop the last two years. In 1931 we raised nothing. In 1932 had fair crop. But no price since making this loan. Federal land bank just laughs at us when we mention the Federal aid given them last winter. Their agent in this district is —, and his attitude is to hell with you and the Government. Is there no help for us? Must we in our old age see our property taken from us?"

GOVERNMENT AGENTS ASSAILED

Influential South Dakota farmer: "And the question was how to get rid of the burden of the feed and seed loans which farmers can not pay at these prices of farm products. And these Government agents or collectors that are located around different towns are watching the farmers so they can't sell a bushel of grain or a cow or hog unless they are there to take over the check. The farmer can get along without anything. Over the line in the next county a farmer sold a load of barley so as to get a little money so as not to starve and freeze to death for a little while. And they had him arrested, and he was poor and couldn't put up bonds, so they keep him in jail to serve his time until the proper time comes for his hearing.

"And one of my nearest neighbors took a truck load of cattle to Sioux Falls, and he did not have no seed loan, but he borrowed a little money from the Government so he could raise a bunch of hogs and feed his stuff through last spring. And when the cattle were sold the Government held the money for the whole truck load, and they only had mortgage on a little better than

half the load, and the rest of them did not have no mortgage on, and this was a man who always paid his accounts in full.

"These agents must be instructed to watch the farmer worse than the devil watches the soul. The way the farmers are tied up they can not sell a bushel of grain or a cow, which is not worth much if they could spare it, to get hold of a dollar to get a plow lay sharpened or a bolt for the drag, or any other necessary expense to put in the next crop, without saying anything about food, fuel, and clothing, as people out in the cold Northwest, a lot of them, got to get along with very little clothing and slim feeding.

"It seems like the people are not going to stand for this situation much longer. It will not surprise me that revolution may break out at any time, which I hope will never happen."

WARNING OF "OMINOUS" SITUATION

President of a mortgage company: "Business is at a standstill; it is paralyzed. Revolt against government is occurring daily. Decrees of court are being physically opposed. Owners of equities do not propose to be divested of their farms even if they are compelled to resort to physical violence. The militia of this State will not fire to kill when called upon to suppress these disorders. This revolt is spreading like a prairie fire."

Business man: "The growling of the frantic taxpayer out here in the Middle West is becoming ominous. Heretofore there have been feeble protests against conditions, but they are rapidly assuming almost revolutionary proportions. Farmers, especially, faced with losing farms on which they have labored for a half century, are demanding a drastic reduction in taxes, not a mere shifting of the burden from one shoulder to the other. Foreclosure sales and deficiency judgment sales are being halted daily by threatening groups.

"One of the sore points is the terrific expenditures of the Veterans' Bureau, especially in the matter of hospitalization for injuries and disabilities not incurred in line of duty. Another is the inequality of pay for Government clerks, etc., when compared to the earnings of the average small-town man or woman.

"The present lame-duck session is the laughing stock of the country. And the horrors of inflated currency are being dinned in our ears by the daily press, although every one knows that some form of inflation will be necessary if this country ever hopes to pull through this crisis."

WEST "DRIVEN TO DESPERATION"

Minister: "The West has been driven to desperation and if the East does not awaken to the peril, the time may be near when the great agricultural States will be compelled to use means to relieve the situation without Congress. During the time of the war men deliberately inflated our currency and then they deflated it and left this immense debt on our hands without medium with which to meet obligations. I am a minister of the gospel, but know that all those who made money out of the blood of the young men who were killed during the war will have to give it up again, and the sooner they do it the safer it will be for them, for if this hatred that is being cultivated because of injustice is not righted, I fear that many of those men will lose their lives in the conflagration that is being kindled."

Minister: "We wonder if the East has any conception of what is going on here. Was in the office of the sheriff of this county to-day and heard the deputy sheriff speak of the manner of selling foreclosures. They do it by subterfuge. Representatives of the mortgage holders meet in the sheriff's office. They are not seen by the farmers nor any one else if it can be prevented. The deputy goes to the steps of the courthouse, mumbles awhile, then comes back and accepts, in his office, the bid of the representatives of the mortgage holder at such figure as may be offered, who then goes on his way, and a deficiency judgment is entered by the judge sitting. This procedure permits the mortgage holder to ask for a receiver, who takes charge during the redemption year, who can hold the crops, take the personal property, and so clean out the farmer of all he has."

"GENERAL UPRISING" REPORTED

Farmer: "The farmers and the townspeople are losing their homes by the hundreds, meetings are being held behind closed doors and the townspeople are joining the farmers in a general uprising. If this continues, this whole country will go down a mass of ruination and wreckage."

Banker: "A man drove out to a farm sale with the intention of buying farm equipment, as he is planning on starting farming this spring. When an article was sold he placed a bid, but was immediately tapped on the shoulder and told not to place any bid. He thought they were bluffing, and the auctioneer called for bids, but he raised the bid that was already placed and he does not know what hit him, but he was laid out cold and needed the doctor's care. Shall these lawless parties go unmolested by our law or what course should be pursued? People are desperate these days; they say Congress talks beer while people are more interested in their homes and enough to eat."

Lawyer: "An insurance man came out here a while ago to sell a farm. He went out and looked over the stock and equipment and went into the barn. Hanging from a beam there was a rope with a noose in it. He said, 'What's that for?' They told him that it would probably be used later and he left in a hurry. Later his lawyer, who was to have met him there, came out, and he was shown the noose and told that the sale would take place right away and he would act as clerk. So he did, and the sale was made for \$60, and then he was told to go home, that the sale was over, and not to come back."

"PENNY SALES" DESCRIBED

State legislator: "I told you in my other letter that there were symptoms of an uprising among the farmers. You are probably aware of the fact that not only in Iowa but in all parts of Nebraska the farmers are gathering in numbers where there are farm foreclosures and chattel mortgage sales, and they have been stopped. In the chattel mortgage sales if they weren't stopped, they didn't have but one bid on property put up. Cows selling for 10 cents a head, horses 50 and 75 cents a head, the property afterwards turned over to the family. I feel quite sure, with the temper of the people, that had they been resisted it would have been disastrous to the person insisting on going through with the sale."

Business man: "The plight of the farmers is growing worse and worse as time goes on. It is surely time that America takes some definite steps to save its agriculture from utter destruction. People are not always going to starve in a country where its producers are providing food in abundance and losing their homes and farms in the process, while 80 per cent of the national wealth finds its way into the hands of 4 per cent of the people. America should bow its head in shame in the face of such a situation. To say that America can not protect and foster its basic industry and feed its willing toilers is to abjectly confess the bankruptcy of American statesmanship and admit that democracy itself is a dismal failure. It is time to act. Agriculture has suffered miserably for 10 long years at the hands of its own Government. Largely from this cause this Nation is in perilous times. Things are going from bad to worse until the temperament of the people is becoming ominous."

These letters could be duplicated by the hundred. They are typical of what the farming communities are now writing to the representatives in Congress. There is almost no demand for a change in government, although some people question the present system—for the most part they believe that some method can be found through legislation to relieve distress and they are still hoping for positive action.

Mr. BROOKHART. Mr. President, I desire to speak briefly upon the amendment offered by the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. FRAZIER] at this time.

I think the Senator from North Dakota is not entirely familiar with our systems of training in the United States. The part of the bill he is seeking to strike out pertains to civilian training, the most desirable kind of training in our country. It is the most historic training. It was the riflemen of Lexington who opened the Revolutionary War in a vigorous contest with the regular-trained English soldiers. It was the riflemen of Morgan who defeated Tarleton and the riflemen of other generals who made the resistance to the English Army effective later on in the Revolutionary War.

Coming on down to the War of 1812, it was the riflemen of Andrew Jackson at New Orleans who drove back the conquerors of Napoleon. In the Mexican War the same story was repeated, and in the Civil War the most effective military training was that of the riflemen, the squirrel shooters, as it were.

Then a new idea came into the minds of those in control of the Regular Army of the United States, came into the minds of the General Staff, and took possession of the War College. It was found in the firing school at Fort Sill, in the military school at Fort Leavenworth, the strangest of all ideas, and it was about like the idea of the Senator from North Dakota for striking out this amendment. That idea was that a poor shot gets more hits in battle than a good one.

Mr. President, it may seem incredible to the ordinary mind that the highest military authorities in our country would ever conceive such an idea, and then that they would systematically teach it in all the Army schools; but such was the case for a whole generation.

When I came to train my company of the Spanish-American War, I was issued 30 rounds of ammunition per man to train that company. At that time I knew nothing particularly about rifle training. I had only had the experience of the ordinary farmer boy in shooting rabbits and squirrels and things of that kind. But instinctively I knew that you could not train a man to defend his life with 30 rounds of ammunition.

In addition to that those rounds of ammunition had to be fired under these peculiar conditions. A man stood up and fired 10 rounds at a target 200 yards away. The possible score would be 50. If he made 34 out of the 50, he was permitted to move back to 300 yards, and there he would kneel and fire 10 rounds more at the same target. If he

made a score of 32, he was then permitted to move back to 500 yards, and in a prone position fire 10 shots on a larger target. Then his training was complete. If at the 200-yard stage the man made a score of only 33, instead of 34, his training was completed at that point. In other words, the poorer he was, the less training he got. Likewise he was halted at the 300-yard point if he made only 31 instead of 32.

Mr. President, that idea prevailed in the Regular Army, never in the National Guard, never in the civilian rifle clubs, never among those who knew anything about shooting a rifle, but it did prevail with the biggest generals of the Army, and was in the textbooks. I myself helped to get it out of some of them, in part at least, although it is not yet entirely removed.

Mr. President, that idea prevailed right up into the World War, and it was on the 21st of October, 1917, after we had been nearly six months in the war, that General Pershing found out that that theory was not working in battle. He had been over in France nearly six months before he learned it. He sent a cablegram, then, demanding that some attention be given to marksmanship training.

Later, on an amendment I propose to offer myself after the pending amendment is disposed of, I shall discuss matters as they occurred during the World War. I want now to review these items in this bill, all of which are very meager and very inadequate, all of which have been in the bills for many years, and all of which are for civilian training.

I think the principal reason why the theorists of the General Staff evolved that other theory of marksmanship was this—that marksmanship training is an individual matter, and if one becomes efficient and expert in marksmanship he does not do it under orders. The military idea is to do everything under orders, and even in their training to-day, as far as possible, they keep every act and every movement of the man they are training under orders.

The civilian idea of marksmanship is to teach and train the man to do it himself so that he will be independent and able to take care of himself under all conditions, and I think that was the fundamental dividing line in this matter of training. Therefore marksmanship was dropped out of the Army practically for a whole generation, and it came back only during the World War after a year's experience. We had been 13 months and over in the war before the first efficient school was established in the Army for the training of instructors in marksmanship. I want to say that outside of the Marine Corps, which never held to that idea, and which has really efficient training, we sent but few troops to France who were adequately trained in marksmanship.

Mr. President, we often hear that our losses in the World War were due to unpreparedness. There is no more offensive part of that unpreparedness than this false theory of the Regular Army itself, and of the General Staff of the Regular Army, in reference to marksmanship. I think I can say, and I think I can take the details and convince any reasonable man, that two-thirds, perhaps three-fourths of the losses in the Battle of the Argonne could have been avoided by proper training in rifle marksmanship. The marksmanship of the Artillery was better, the marksmanship of the machine gunners even was better, but the old theory sent millions of our men to France, many of whom did not even know how to load a rifle, let alone shoot it. Our school started, as I said, after we had been 13 months in the war, and it trained 7,000 instructors for all the divisions of the Army, but the war was over before they could get into efficient action.

When the school was discontinued at Camp Perry, about the latter part of September, I myself went out to the Nineteenth Regular Division to train them in marksmanship and was with them about 30 days. There were in that division two of the oldest Regular regiments in the United States, the Second Infantry and the Fourteenth Infantry, and they needed the training as much as any troops I found during the war, and I had been special instructor of a

National Army division and of a National Guard division, in addition to being chief instructor of the Camp Perry school and the Camp Benning school.

Mr. President, what does the Senator from North Dakota propose to do by this amendment? At the present time our farmers, the common people of our country, have little opportunity to learn rifle marksmanship. There is not a spot in the State of Iowa where one can fire a high-power rifle without danger of killing somebody, unless there is a prepared rifle range, a military range, as it were, and I doubt whether there are many of them even in North Dakota. So our people are getting away from their traditions, because the opportunity for learning marksmanship has been taken away from them.

Therefore, I strongly oppose striking out the meager amount for training civilians in marksmanship. Here is the District of Columbia. Of course, the Government should pay that expense. That is like a State controlling its National Guard or militia. Then we get \$31,465 for the director of civilian marksmanship office. He is the contact officer for the civilian rifle clubs all over the country and encourages them in every way he can and in some way keeps up the tradition of American marksmanship. There is provided altogether \$125,000, reduced by the Senate committee from \$150,000, for the National Board for the Promotion of Rifle Practice, and so on, in connection with the encouragement of rifle practice. That is a small amount. It is a trifling amount, in fact, for the whole United States. It is only keeping the American tradition alive in a small way in a few communities, but it is spread out into all the States of the Union. It is national in its scope.

The Senator from North Dakota [Mr. FRAZIER] has proposed to strike out these items. I am quite sure he would criticize the vagaries of professional militarism as I would, and I think I criticize them quite as severely as he does; but I do it somewhat with a technical knowledge of the way in which they should be criticized.

I think there is something radically wrong about the leadership of the American Army. The present Chief of Staff has more common sense than most Chiefs of Staff we have had, but the Army still has a lot of vagaries that need to be corrected. Army officers go to the War College and to other schools and for 20 years they plan imaginary wars and fight imaginary battles. Senators who are lawyers, let me call your attention to this situation. Suppose you should go to school for 20 years and would practice law in a moot court before imaginary judges with imaginary cases, what kind of lawyers would you be at the end of that practice? There is very much of professional militarism that is in the same condition of mind as a lawyer would be if trained in that way. It needs to be tempered and changed and modified by civilian training. It was the civilian soldier who won the World War.

There were 17 National Guard divisions, civilian soldiers, who all got ready and went over. I trained one National Guard division in marksmanship. I am fully convinced that if they had not been handicapped by some of the vagaries of military training, they could have prepared themselves and been ready in half the time they did get ready and would have been better prepared.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The time of the Senator from Iowa has expired.

Mr. BROOKHART. I desire my other time on another amendment later.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment proposed by the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. FRAZIER].

The amendment was rejected.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The time of the Senator from Iowa has expired.

Mr. BROOKHART. I desire my other time on another amendment later.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment proposed by the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. FRAZIER].

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. COUZENS. Mr. President, in sending my other amendment to the desk I overlooked the fact that part of the money should be immediately available, because it will be four months before the bill will become effective. I therefore offer the following amendment: After the numerals "\$22,000,000" in the amendment previously agreed to insert in parenthesis the following: "(Of which \$5,000,000 shall be immediately available.)"

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Michigan.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. BROOKHART. Mr. President, I offer the amendment which I send to the desk.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Let the amendment be stated for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 61, after line 6, insert:

NATIONAL BOARD FOR PROMOTION OF RIFLE PRACTICE, ARMY NATIONAL MATCHES

For the national matches and other competitions and the Small Arms Firing School, in accordance with the provisions of the act approved May 29, 1928 (U. S. C., Supp. III, title 32, secs. 181a, 181b), \$450,000.

Mr. BROOKHART obtained the floor.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. BROOKHART. Certainly.

Mr. REED. This would institute a new item of appropriation in the bill. It is clearly in violation of Rule XVI. I feel that I shall have to make the point of order against the amendment.

Mr. BROOKHART. Mr. President, the point of order is debatable.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator address himself to the point of order?

Mr. BROOKHART. Yes. There is an existing law mandatory in its nature directing that these matches be held annually. I have a copy of the law here. The appropriation is to carry out that law. Under Rule XVI the amendment is in order. If the Senator from Pennsylvania has any doubt about it I will show him the law.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Pennsylvania desire to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. REED. The language of the rule is to "add a new item of appropriation, unless it be made to carry out the provisions of some existing law, or treaty stipulation, or act, or resolution previously passed by the Senate during that session."

If the words "previously passed" apply to the nouns that precede, then it must be an existing law passed by the Senate at this session. I am not sure that that construction has ever been adopted, however.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair is of the opinion that the amendment proposed by the Senator from Iowa is designed to carry out the provision of existing law, namely, a statute approved May 29, 1928.

Mr. REED. I am inclined to think it does not violate that part of Rule XVI.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair is therefore of the opinion that the point of order made by the Senator from Pennsylvania must be overruled. The Senator from Iowa is recognized in connection with the amendment.

Mr. BROOKHART. Mr. President, I think the national rifle matches constituted the most important item of military training in the United States before the World War, as they have since that time. I have already given some description of the situation up to the time of the World War. At the beginning of the World War the riflemen of the National Guard were all left at home. Not one of us was ordered into the service. In fact, in the service down on the Mexican border in 1916 our commissions were canceled and we were sent home after a short period of service. Congress restored those commissions. When the war broke out the General Staff of the Army still had its prerogative to exercise, and did not order us into the service. For 15 years I had been fighting, as a member of the national board and otherwise, for the national matches and for adequate marksmanship training in the Army and in the Na-

tional Guard. The last big fight before the war was before Secretary of War Garrison, with General Mills, who was then head of the Militia Bureau. After an all-day discussion, Secretary Garrison decided the matter on every point in favor of the national matches and of marksmanship training.

A little while after that Secretary Garrison resigned and Newton D. Baker became Secretary of War. When he became Secretary of War a memorandum was sent over to him by various officers of the General Staff and War College, in which they said the thing that most needed the attention of the new Secretary was a reorganization of the National Board for the Promotion of Rifle Practice. That was the board that had charge of the national matches. They pointed out that Congress had increased the appropriation up to \$300,000, and that it needed big, broad-minded men to administer the fund. They suggested the men. They suggested the officers who had fought against the appropriation and left off all of us who had fought for and obtained the appropriation from the Congress of the United States. The result was that Secretary Baker removed all of us from the board and put the other crowd on the board.

Then the war came on. We were not ordered into the service, as I have already said. The United States entered the war on the 6th of April. It was on the 21st of October that General Pershing cabled demanding attention to marksmanship. He did not stop with one cablegram. He sent another one the next week, and then every week. There had been a constant fight over the contention that it is the poor shot who gets more hits in battle than the good one, aggravated by the fact that I had condemned 3,000 rifles that had been worn out in the Regular Army in cleaning, not in shooting, but they had been rubbed out by abrasives in cleaning for inspection purposes. Under the rule of the Army the rifle must be so clean that the white glove of the inspecting officer may be rubbed over it without showing any dirt on the glove. Of course, the real rifleman likes to find rifle grease on his gun, because that means the preservation and proper care of the rifle. But the military system of the regular service wants all the grease removed. I had condemned 3,000 of those rifles. They would not hold on a target at 300 yards. They would shine all right; they were beautiful inside. General Crozier came down to the border to see about the condemnation, but they stood condemned when the tests were made. They were not serviceable because they had been rendered absolutely useless.

But all of that put me in bad and I headed the black list in the Ordnance Department. I was not ordered into the service at the beginning of the war. Finally, the Chief of the Militia Bureau was changed and an old rifleman, Col. Ira L. Reeves, a regular, became assistant chief of the bureau. He found this black list. That is how I know it was not a theoretical black list. It was an actual black list. My name had the honor place at the head of it. As soon as he found that, he wrote an order calling me into the service and included a couple of other officers so as to camouflage it somewhat, and then submitted it as an emergency matter to the Assistant Chief of Ordnance. He waited until the chief was out of the city. The assistant signed the order directing me to report for service. Colonel Reeves did not report that to the personnel section, and the first the personnel section knew of it was when I reported. Even after that General McLean, then Adjutant General of the Army, tried to interfere and stop me from coming into the service. The Judge Advocate General ruled against that procedure, and I was in. After I was in, it was harder to put me out than it was to keep me from coming in.

I was first sent to the Winchester plant to study the new rifle, a folly on the part of somebody which led to our adopting the Enfield English rifle, which we copied in part and brought over here. It was not as good a rifle all through as our Springfield rifle. Then I was sent out to join the Eighty-eighth National Army Division to train them in marksmanship. I only had 30 days in which to train them

with a complement of a thousand extra officers, and it was midwinter, being in January, 1918.

Then, under orders, I came back to Washington. A new Chief of Ordnance, General Wheeler, had assumed office in the meantime. He talked this matter over with me fully and gained a real understanding of the purpose of military rifle training. He then had me prepare and submit a report concerning my tour of duty with the Eighty-eighth Division. That was done, and he laid the report on the desk of Secretary Baker, who ordered me to report to him. He had removed me from the national board a year or so before, and I did not know what to expect from him, but I was ready for the interview anyway, and went to his office. He started in very nicely, and asked why this marksmanship training was so inefficient in the Army. General Pershing was sending cablegrams every week about it. I told him of the old theory which was taught in the Army schools—that a poor shot got more hits in battle than a good one, and I explained how they proved it, and all that. He then began asking me about the generals. They were the same generals who had blacklisted me, and so I did not hesitate to give my opinion of them. Well, one of them four days later was removed and sent to Panama where he enforced the prohibition law and was a very good officer down there. Within 10 days the Secretary of War removed a second one from the position of chief of the War College and sent him out to command the Western Department at San Francisco. Nobody reported to the Western Department, and the department commander there had nothing to do but to keep his feet on the desk. In a couple of weeks more the Secretary of War removed another general from the national board and put me back on it. That is the way I got out of that mess.

Then, Mr. President, the Secretary of War asked me to suggest a plan for training the Army in rifle shooting. I told him we had been then in the war for nearly a year; that the training ought to have started the first day of the war but at that late date there was only one feasible plan, and that was to establish a central school somewhere and to send there details of officers, the higher their rank the better, who should be trained as instructors for all the Army divisions. I asked him to send for Colonel Mumma, of the Regular Army, a famous rifleman, who was then on the General Staff, whose offices were right across the hall from his office. I told him he would get very much the same set of facts from Colonel Mumma that he had obtained from me but in different language, because Colonel Mumma was disciplined, while I was not. While referring to certain generals, I had mentioned the National Board for the Promotion of Rifle Practice, and the Secretary then seemed in a way to remember something about it. He asked me, "Are you on the national board?" I said, "No, sir; one of the first things you did as Secretary of War was to remove me from the national board." He wanted to know how that happened. Then I told him. I said, "You have organized that board a second time in the last few days; you have good men. Colonel Reeves is on it now and also Colonel Mumma; some of those on the board are not right but the majority are all right, and I have no objection to the board." He was not satisfied with that explanation and wanted to know more about it. Then I told him how the War College and the Adjutant General's Office and other bureaus had sent these memoranda over to him as soon as he was appointed Secretary of War. He remembered that, and there was then a mad Secretary of War, because evidently those memoranda had concealed the real truth from the new Secretary of War.

I presume that is the reason why those generals were afterwards removed so suddenly. There was their own evidence that stood against them. So he asked me how we should train the Army. I told him we would have to establish a central school. He asked me where we would get the staff for such a school. I told him there were 50 or 100 riflemen who had been trained by participating in the national matches through all the years, the foremost riflemen and the greatest instructors in the world, who, like

myself, had not been ordered into the service; and that we could make up the best training staff of riflemen the world ever knew without disturbing any organization that he had set up for the prosecution of the war. He then said, "I get your idea." Before being dismissed I asked him to send for Colonel Mumma. He did so; ordered the school to be established at Camp Perry, Ohio, and then went away to France.

Mr. President, after the issuance of that order the War College sent for me. I was then a very welcome guest there. Of course, the War College had some new leaders, and they were very well pleased to be the new leaders. So we prepared a memorandum for this school. We started it up through the General Staff. The system prevailed of requiring every order to go the rounds of all the various bureaus, and, if any one general disapproved, that killed the order. It got up to General Graves, who subsequently commanded the American Army in Russia. I may digress to say that I hope all Senators who have not done so will read the book on Russia written by General Graves; it is a magnificent book and tells the whole truth. General Graves did not know what the order was all about; so he marked it "disapproved." However, the Assistant Secretary of War had been ordered to establish this school, and he sent for General Graves and told him that the Secretary of War had ordered that the school be established. All General Graves wanted then was a little change in some administrative features of the school. So we took the order back to the War College, revamped it to suit General Graves, and started it through the mill again.

General March had just returned to Washington to be Chief of Staff, and, as the newspapers said, he was the selection of General Pershing. General Pershing sent a cablegram every week requesting that something be done regarding training in marksmanship. So we expected no opposition from General March. But, Mr. President, after the memorandum had been clear through the various offices of the General Staff I saw it marked "Disapproved, Peyton C. March, major general, Chief of Staff." That was just before his promotion to general. Mr. Crowell, Assistant Secretary of War, then sent for General March and told him that the establishment of the school was one of the things that was to happen in the course of human events. General March then erased the word "disapproved" and marked the order "approved." The school was then established. Mr. President, it was on the 10th day of May, 1918, after we had been in the war for over 13 months that this school was opened. When it was opened it had a class of 1,100 officers from all the divisions of the Army who were to be trained as instructors of marksmanship in the Army.

Outside the Marine Corps—the Marine Corps are well trained in marksmanship—the only efficient training the Army got in marksmanship came from the officers who had learned the whole theory and system of marksmanship training in the national matches.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The time of the Senator from Iowa has expired.

Mr. BROOKHART. Has my whole 30 minutes expired?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The time of the Senator on the amendment only has expired. The Senator may now have 15 minutes on the bill.

Mr. BROOKHART. That is what I thought.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator is recognized for 15 minutes on the bill.

Mr. BROOKHART. Mr. President, after this school was established and began training 1,100 officers a month it became the most popular school of the Army; in fact, General March gave out some statement expressing great approval of the establishment of this school. When the fall came, it was decided to send us South during the winter so that we could work all winter. There was an intermission of about a month, when I went out with the Nineteenth Regular Division, of which I have spoken. Then I was ordered to Camp Bennings, Ga., to establish the new firing school there. That was just a few days before the armistice was signed.

Mr. President, the national matches broke down the old theory of the Regular Army; they changed the whole system. When I reached Bennings the commandant of that school was the author of the book on the Rifle in War, that had taught the theory that the poor shot gets more hits in battle than the good one. He entirely reversed his position. I never had an argument with him while I was down there, and we went ahead with the marksmanship training at Bennings very much as it had been carried on at Camp Perry. I may say, however, that since then a good many of the things that make for efficiency in marksmanship training have been eliminated from the training.

Following the war there was no trouble about providing for the matches until last year; but the General Staff is still not favorable to the national matches, because it reaches out into civilian training, and they want the training to be solely professional; they do not want a civilian really to know that he can become an efficient marksman. The Congress, however, has always stood by the national matches. Last year there was nothing said about them, and the item was cut out, under the promise that it would be restored this year; but this year it is again left out. So I have offered this amendment to restore the item so that the national matches may be continued. Under the economy rule that has been followed, I have reduced the amount 10 per cent and ask only for \$450,000 instead of \$500,000. I think it is the best spent of any of the money used for military training; it is real American training; it is worth the money in every particular, and I think it will hold its place in the future as well as it has in the past.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment proposed by the Senator from Iowa.

Mr. FRAZIER. Mr. President, I can not agree with my good friend from Iowa. The \$450,000 which he proposes to put into this bill for national rifle matches might better be used, in my opinion, to pay off forty-five \$10,000 mortgages for farmers and home owners out in his State, and there are many more than that who need their mortgages paid off.

Mr. BROOKHART. Mr. President—

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from North Dakota yield to the Senator from Iowa.

Mr. FRAZIER. I yield.

Mr. BROOKHART. If the Senator will secure an amendment making such provision as he suggests, I will agree to it.

Mr. FRAZIER. I will vote for it; but I can not, I am afraid, secure such an amendment. There would be objection to an amendment of that kind, but I think such an amendment should be made.

Mr. President, I wanted to state that several times when the Army appropriation bill has been before the Senate I have offered an amendment to prohibit the use of any of the funds for compulsory military training in land-grant colleges. I do not intend to offer such an amendment this year, as I feel it would be futile; but I do wish to call attention to an incident that occurred at the University of Maryland last fall. A young man entered that university but refused to take military training on the ground that, from religious principles, he was opposed to war and military training. The authorities at the university, after considering his refusal, expelled him, or would not allow him to continue his classes. He went into court, and a few days ago the court held that the authorities of the University of Maryland had no right to bar the young man from attending the university because he refused to take military drill on the ground of religious conviction. I understand the case has been appealed to the Supreme Court.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment proposed by the Senator from Iowa [Mr. BROOKHART].

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that if and when this bill shall pass it may be printed with the amendments of the Senate numbered.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. SCHUYLER. Mr. President, I desire to submit an amendment very simple in character but in the interest of justice.

I direct the attention of the Senate to page 11, lines 16 to 19, by which it is provided—

That no appropriation contained in this act shall be available for the pay and allowance of any commissioned officer convicted of felony and which conviction has been confirmed by an appellate court.

I seek to strike out line 19 and insert the words "has been finally confirmed."

It will be realized upon a moment's reflection that an officer who has been convicted, and whose conviction has been affirmed by an appellate court, yet has open to him under the law certain other appellate procedure by way, first, of petition for rehearing in the appellate court which has affirmed the conviction, and beyond that, an appeal for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court, the court of last resort.

It does not seem consonant with justice that an officer who has been faithful as a military officer, but has been convicted of some felony, should be deprived of his pay midway in the battle for his vindication.

I feel that my amendment clarifies the intention of the proviso; and I sincerely trust that the Senator from Pennsylvania and the Senate will find the amendment acceptable.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, may I make a suggestion to the Senator?

Mr. SCHUYLER. I shall be pleased to receive it.

Mr. REED. It seems to me the language in lines 18 and 19 is not very lawyerlike. Conviction is never the subject of an appeal. It is the sentence which is appealed.

Mr. SCHUYLER. Yes; that is true.

Mr. REED. The action of the appellate court does not confirm a sentence. It affirms it.

Mr. SCHUYLER. The Senator is quite right.

Mr. REED. Would the Senator be willing to change that language?

Mr. SCHUYLER. Yes, indeed—"and which sentence has been finally affirmed." I welcome that suggestion, Mr. President.

Mr. REED. I have no objection.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on the amendment proposed by the Senator from Colorado.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I desire to offer an amendment.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 48, line 15, after the word "Guard," insert the following: "or Organized Reserves."

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment proposed by the Senator from Missouri.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I do not think the amendment is necessary, because the Senator will find at the bottom of page 52, line 23, that there is exactly the same provision there for the Organized Reserves.

Mr. CLARK. I had overlooked that, Mr. President. I withdraw the amendment.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill is still before the Senate and open to further amendment. If there be no further amendment to be proposed, the question is, Shall the amendments be engrossed and the bill be read a third time?

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

AMENDMENT OF THE CONSTITUTION—REPEAL OF PROHIBITION

Mr. BLAINE. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the Senate Joint Resolution 211, proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the motion proposed by the Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. McNARY and Mr. LA FOLLETTE addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Wisconsin yield to the Senator from Oregon?

Mr. BLAINE. I yield to the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, I hope it is not the intention of the able Senator from Wisconsin to press his motion to-night. I should like to have a recess taken now, and have the motion pending in the morning. I think that will be satisfactory to the Senator.

Mr. BLAINE. The request of the Senator from Oregon is agreeable to me.

RECESS

Mr. McNARY. I move that the Senate take a recess until 12 o'clock noon to-morrow.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Oregon.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 33 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until to-morrow, Tuesday, February 14, 1933, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate February 13 (legislative day of February 10), 1933

PROMOTIONS IN THE NAVY

MARINE CORPS

First Lieut. William P. Kelly to be a captain in the Marine Corps from the 25th day of December, 1932.

Second Lieut. William W. Benson to be a first lieutenant in the Marine Corps from the 21st day of January, 1933.

Corp. Eustace R. Smoak, a meritorious noncommissioned officer, to be a second lieutenant in the Marine Corps, revocable for two years, from the 9th day of February, 1933.

POSTMASTERS

CALIFORNIA

Richard M. Wood to be postmaster at Thermal, Calif., in place of W. P. Rouse, resigned.

CONNECTICUT

Arthur N. Johnson to be postmaster at Darien, Conn., in place of C. W. Brage, removed.

FLORIDA

Emma M. Cromartie to be postmaster at Reddick, Fla., in place of E. M. Cromartie. Incumbent's commission expired January 8, 1933.

IDAHO

Theodore Turner to be postmaster at Pocatello, Idaho, in place of A. B. Bean, deceased.

ILLINOIS

John H. Wehrley to be postmaster at Beecher, Ill., in place of J. H. Wehrley. Incumbent's commission expires March 2, 1933.

Paul R. Beebe to be postmaster at Forreston, Ill., in place of P. R. Beebe. Incumbent's commission expired February 5, 1933.

Earl L. Longfellow to be postmaster at Rock Falls, Ill., in place of E. L. Longfellow. Incumbent's commission expires February 28, 1933.

William C. Nulle to be postmaster at Union, Ill., in place of W. C. Nulle. Incumbent's commission expires March 2, 1933.

INDIANA

George H. Griffith to be postmaster at Fremont, Ind., in place of G. H. Griffith. Incumbent's commission expires February 18, 1933.

KANSAS

Emil Dolecek to be postmaster at Holyrood, Kans., in place of Emil Dolecek. Incumbent's commission expired December 8, 1932.

Neva F. Van Dolah to be postmaster at Preston, Kans., in place of N. F. Van Dolah. Incumbent's commission expires March 2, 1933.

KENTUCKY

Annie C. Justice to be postmaster at Allensville, Ky., in place of A. M. Coleman. Incumbent's commission expired February 27, 1932.

Rebecca Green to be postmaster at Barbourville, Ky., in place of Rebecca Green. Incumbent's commission expires February 28, 1933.

LOUISIANA

Amy B. Griffin to be postmaster at Gilbert, La., in place of A. B. Griffin. Incumbent's commission expired January 19, 1933.

MARYLAND

Lewis J. Williams to be postmaster at Bel Air, Md., in place of L. J. Williams. Incumbent's commission expires March 2, 1933.

Aubrey R. Cole to be postmaster at Linthicum Heights, Md. Office became presidential July 1, 1932.

MICHIGAN

Blanche Bowen to be postmaster at Augusta, Mich., in place of J. N. Kart, deceased.

Otto R. Lund to be postmaster at Michigamme, Mich., in place of G. J. Murray, resigned.

MINNESOTA

Nels E. Berg to be postmaster at Cokato, Minn., in place of N. E. Berg. Incumbent's commission expires February 25, 1933.

Charles A. Morse to be postmaster at Elk River, Minn., in place of C. A. Morse. Incumbent's commission expired March 29, 1932.

Richard C. O'Neill to be postmaster at Graceville, Minn., in place of R. C. O'Neill. Incumbent's commission expires March 2, 1933.

Ferdinand J. Reimers to be postmaster at Stewart, Minn., in place of F. J. Reimers. Incumbent's commission expires March 2, 1933.

MISSISSIPPI

Virginia B. Duckworth to be postmaster at Prentiss, Miss., in place of V. B. Duckworth. Incumbent's commission expires March 2, 1933.

MISSOURI

Sallie F. Duncan to be postmaster at Dearborn, Mo., in place of S. F. Duncan. Incumbent's commission expired January 13, 1932.

Earl M. Brittain to be postmaster at Guilford, Mo., in place of E. M. Brittain. Incumbent's commission expires March 2, 1933.

Walter A. Rankin to be postmaster at Tarkio, Mo., in place of C. H. Duncan. Incumbent's commission expired May 26, 1932.

MONTANA

Joseph F. Dolin to be postmaster at Medicine Lake, Mont., in place of J. F. Dolin. Incumbent's commission expires March 2, 1933.

NEW JERSEY

Charles A. Britton to be postmaster at Frenchtown, N. J., in place of C. A. Britton. Incumbent's commission expires February 28, 1933.

Charles Carter to be postmaster at Mount Ephraim, N. J., in place of Charles Carter. Incumbent's commission expired February 8, 1933.

NEW MEXICO

James A. Lewis to be postmaster at Alamogordo, N. Mex., in place of O. G. Cady. Incumbent's commission expired March 1, 1930.

Clotilde C. Montes to be postmaster at Bernalillo, N. Mex., in place of C. C. Montes. Incumbent's commission expired April 20, 1932.

OHIO

Katherine M. Crafts to be postmaster at Mantua, Ohio., in place of K. M. Crafts. Incumbent's commission expires February 25, 1933.

OKLAHOMA

Nellie S. Hall to be postmaster at Canton, Okla., in place of N. S. Hall. Incumbent's commission expires March 2, 1933.

Maude S. Chambers to be postmaster at Jenks, Okla., in place of M. S. Chambers. Incumbent's commission expired May 26, 1932.

Clark Moss to be postmaster at Wagoner, Okla., in place of E. B. Foster. Incumbent's commission expired February 10, 1931.

PENNSYLVANIA

Harry D. Stevens to be postmaster at Folcroft, Pa., in place of H. D. Stevens. Incumbent's commission expires March 2, 1933.

Anna R. Parker to be postmaster at Kulpmont, Pa., in place of A. R. Parker. Incumbent's commission expired January 9, 1933.

Eleanor Niland to be postmaster at West Brownsville, Pa., in place of Eleanor Niland. Incumbent's commission expired February 12, 1933.

SOUTH CAROLINA

William H. F. Faddis to be postmaster at Clearwater, S. C. Office became presidential July 1, 1932.

TENNESSEE

Homer W. Black to be postmaster at Bolivar, Tenn., in place of H. W. Black. Incumbent's commission expired February 12, 1933.

TEXAS

Sylvan S. McCrary to be postmaster at Joaquin, Tex., in place of S. S. McCrary. Incumbent's commission expired December 18, 1932.

WEST VIRGINIA

William O. Crawford to be postmaster at Cabin creek, W. Va., in place of W. O. Crawford. Incumbent's commission expires February 28, 1933.

Monroe Burns to be postmaster at Cairo, W. Va., in place of Monroe Burns. Incumbent's commission expires February 28, 1933.

James R. Wratford to be postmaster at Moorefield, W. Va., in place of J. R. Wratford. Incumbent's commission expires March 2, 1933.

Thomas A. Jones to be postmaster at Mount Hope, W. Va., in place of T. A. Jones. Incumbent's commission expired February 13, 1933.

WISCONSIN

Fred Hennig to be postmaster at Bowler, Wis., in place of Fred Hennig. Incumbent's commission expires February 28, 1933.

Jessie M. McGeorge to be postmaster at Stone Lake, Wis., in place of J. M. McGeorge. Incumbent's commission expires February 25, 1933.

Arthur Heins to be postmaster at Tigerton, Wis., in place of Arthur Heins. Incumbent's commission expires February 28, 1933.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MONDAY, FEBRUARY 13, 1933

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O Spirit Divine, Thou dost prefer before all temples a pure and an upright heart. Instruct us, for Thou knowest; illuminate us, that Thy ways to the world may be justified. Thou hast provided for us One who stands for us in the moral gap of sin. With all our hearts may we love and know Him; bless us with the peace of a perfect trust. Thy Holy Word is with us: "A man shall be as a hiding place from the tempest and a refuge from the storm; as rivers of water in a dry place and as a shadow of a great rock in a weary land." O God, in this hour especially, make our lives strong, helpful, and beneficent; how this old earth is mourning for

such. Arouse us with unflinching powers and influences that shall deliver our country out of the valley of distress and revive an emancipating hope and faith everywhere. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Saturday, February 11, 1933, was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Craven, its principal clerk, announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the bill (H. R. 7716) entitled "An act to amend the radio act of 1927, approved February 23, 1927, as amended (U. S. C., Supp. V, title 47, ch. 4), and for other purposes," disagreed to by the House; agrees to the conference asked by the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. COUZENS, Mr. WATSON, Mr. FESS, Mr. SMITH, and Mr. DILL to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate had agreed to the amendment of the House to a bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 4339. An act repealing certain provisions of the act of June 21, 1906, as amended, relating to the sale and encumbrance of lands of Kickapoo and affiliated Indians of Oklahoma.

The message also announced that the Senate disagrees to the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 2148) entitled "An act for the relief of Clarence R. Killion," requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. REED, Mr. CUTTING, and Mr. FLETCHER to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

EQUALIZATION OF TARIFF DUTIES

Mr. SCHAFFER. Mr. Speaker, I call up the bill (H. R. 8557) to equalize tariff duties by compensating for depreciation in foreign currencies, on the calendar of motions to discharge committees.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Wisconsin is recognized for 10 minutes and the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. COLLIER] for 10 minutes.

Mr. SCHAFFER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself two minutes.

Mr. Speaker, this is a vote for or against the consideration of legislation which has for its purpose the protection of American markets from invasion and destruction by floods of importations from foreign countries whose currencies have depreciated.

This is a vote that should not be approached from a party standpoint but from a truly American standpoint, as it provides simply for consideration of legislation to protect American industry, American workers employed therein, and the products of the American farms from unfair foreign competition. A vote for the motion really is a vote for America and American products first and foreign nations and foreign products second. Every country has an inherent and prior right to its home markets. We should defend those markets and hold them for our own nationals as a matter of right, just as we would defend our soil against the invasion of an enemy alien army.

I particularly call upon the progressive Republicans who, with me in 1923, supported the discharge rule and claimed we had won a great victory when it was incorporated in the rules of the House.

I call upon the Democratic progressives and the Republican progressives to join with us to-day and vote for this motion in order to bring before the House for consideration this important legislation which has been chloroformed in committee and grant the opportunity desired by 145 Members who signed the discharge petition. Let your actions confirm your promises.

Mr. Speaker, I now yield one-half minute to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. CAMPBELL].

Mr. CAMPBELL of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, ladies and gentlemen of the House, I am one of those who voted against the Hawley-Smoot tariff bill. I did so for the reason that although I am a firm believer in a protective tariff I feared

the consequences of retaliatory tariffs; however, the question before us to-day is whether or not we are to consider the great influx of goods which are coming into this country by reason of the depreciated currency abroad.

If it is true that the great portion of these goods are crippling our manufacturers by the sale of merchandise far below the cost of production, then the present tariff is not even a competitive tariff, so far as such goods are concerned.

It ought to at least be carefully considered on the floor of this House. I am one who wishes to hear the arguments on both sides with an open mind. Ten minutes' debate on each side is a joke. Bring the Crowther bill on the floor, subject to amendments, produce the proper statistics, grant plenty of time for debate, and let us consider the matter in the way that all important measures should be considered in this Congress.

Mr. SCHAFER. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time, as we have only one speech on this side.

Mr. COLLIER. Mr. Speaker, I have 10 minutes, and I have promised to yield 5 minutes of the time to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. DOUGHTON]. I now yield myself two minutes.

Mr. Speaker, of course, in this limited time it is impossible to go into a discussion of the merits of this question. I may simply say that I shall not make the charge that the Hawley-Smoot bill is responsible for the depression we are in, but I do make the charge, without fear of successful contradiction, that the prohibitive rates in the Hawley-Smoot tariff bill have done more to aggravate and continue this depression than any other one thing. Furthermore, it was an active issue in the last campaign, and the American people have repudiated it.

Mr. BURTNESS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COLLIER. I can not yield in two minutes, and the gentleman should not expect me to.

I may say in regard to the gentleman from New York [Mr. CROWTHER] we were engaged in hearings on the Hill bill, which is similar to his bill, and we had the experts from the Tariff Commission, as well as other men of national prominence, waiting to be heard when this bill was taken from the committee by the rule to discharge; and I may say further that the gentleman from New York [Mr. CROWTHER] has never asked the chairman or, as far as I can learn, any other member of the committee for a hearing on his bill. The first intimation I had that the gentleman from New York had a bill was when the gentleman from Wisconsin brought in a motion to discharge.

The chief economist of the Tariff Commission, who is also a great political economist—

Mr. CHINDBLOM. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COLLIER. The gentleman knows I can not yield in two minutes for a legal discussion from my good friend from Illinois.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. COLLIER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself one-half minute more.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. If the gentleman will permit—

Mr. COLLIER. The gentleman will not permit.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. We had hearings on the Crowther bill before the committee in May of last year.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. COLLIER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself one-half minute more.

Mr. Durand, the chief economist of the Tariff Commission, said that the Crowther bill was an embargo against all the world.

Every man who votes for this motion of the gentleman from Wisconsin is not only voting to indorse the Hawley-Smoot Act, but is indorsing it with an increase of anywhere from 25 to 50 per cent and as much as 800 per cent against some countries, and, according to the chief economist of the Tariff Commission is also voting for a bill which is an embargo against the world.

Mr. Speaker, I yield the balance of five minutes to the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. VINSON].

Mr. VINSON of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, this bill, H. R. 8557, introduced by the gentleman from New York [Mr. CROWTHER] has for its title, "To equalize tariff duties by compensating for depreciation in foreign countries."

Strictly speaking, this is not a vote on the measure itself, but is upon a motion to discharge the Committee on Ways and Means from its consideration and place it upon immediate passage. The motion involved is an extraordinary one. Some may say that they are opposed to discharging the committee under the admitted facts that it has in no sense been recreant of its duties toward this legislation. In the last session hearings were had upon the identical bill before the whole committee. With the party lines broken, the committee voted against reporting it out 16 to 9. Last spring, before the election, when this measure was considered on its merits, three of the Republican members voted against reporting it from the committee, one of whom was the distinguished gentleman who just made his interrogation, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CHINDBLOM]. [Applause.]

However, it is not necessary to hide behind the parliamentary situation in opposing this motion. The bill is a vicious one and actually defeats, in many instances, the laudable purpose claimed for it by its sponsors. As a matter of fact, it is simply a political gesture out of which our Republican friends hope to secure some solace.

We direct our attention to the bill itself and the result that would flow from it if it were enacted into law:

First. Propaganda claims that the country is flooded with importations from the depreciated-currency countries. This is conclusively refuted in the fact that imports into this country for the first 11 months of 1932 were less than the imports for a similar period in 1931. The official figures are as follows: \$1,424,473,000 for 1932, and \$2,199,611,000 for 1931. Dutiable imports for 1932, \$466,192,000, as against \$743,280,000 for like period in 1931.

The official figures from the Tariff Commission show that there was a decrease for this period in 1932, over like period in 1931, of 33 per cent in value and 20 per cent in volume.

Further, it is unquestioned that the exports from this country to the depreciated-currency countries in each particular instance, exceeds the imports from those countries during the past year. Another statement might be significant—the value of all our dutiable imports for 1932 are slightly over \$500,000,000. The value of all imports for the year 1929 is \$4,399,361,000. The proponents of this bill are in a ridiculous position when they say that this country is being flooded with imports when a few short months ago they were proclaiming that the Smoot-Hawley tariff bill was protecting American farmers, and laborers, and industry from this very evil. Then, the value of all imports for the last year is one-third of the imports of 1929, the last year before the Smoot-Hawley tariff.

Second. This bill creates a tariff upon every article imported from a country that has depreciated its currency. When the Smoot-Hawley tariff bill was written, the articles placed upon the free list certainly were articles that should have been placed thereon. Now, without rhyme or reason, without an effort for matured deliberation, the proponents of this measure would place every such article on the dutiable list.

As a matter of fact, many of the larger articles concerning which most propaganda has been concerned are articles on the free list. Newspaper print and wood pulp have been on the free list for many, many years. This measure would automatically put a tariff of different proportions upon this commodity, as well as others now on the free list.

Third. The date fixed in the bill for determining when the depreciation of currency occurred is October 1, 1931. Many nations had depreciated their currency prior to that time. France, who cut the franc 80 per cent in value, yet remained on the gold standard, would not be affected by this measure. Without doubt, France, the defaulter, would be given marked preference over our neighbor Canada, and our kinsman, Great Britain, who met the promised payment on her debt.

Fourth. Upon Saturday, the distinguished leader of the minority, Mr. SNELL, in colloquy with me, had this to say relative to the Crowther bill:

Mr. VINSON of Kentucky. Does not the gentleman realize that the nations who depreciated their currency prior to the date fixed, whether it be October 1, 1931, or some date in 1932, will have an advantage over those countries that have depreciated their currency subsequent to the date fixed in the bill.

Mr. SNELL. I want to use them all alike, I want to use them exactly the same. I want to see to it, in other words, that imports coming from those countries at the present time shall come in under what is practically American valuation.

This measure does not "use them all alike" or "use them exactly the same"; it does not substantially give similar treatment, nor does it permit imports from the countries affected to "come in under what is practically American valuation." The things that the distinguished gentlemen from New York wants can not take place under this scheme. There would be manifold discriminations. American valuation would not be involved. The language of the bill excludes that. The different nations have depreciated their currency at different times, in different amounts, and with different rates. Japan, for instance, has depreciated her yen 50 per cent; England depreciated her pound practically 25 per cent; France depreciated her franc 80 per cent before the date set forth in the bill, and as stated, is now on a gold basis. Any increase in the rate of any commodity shipped by these three countries would penalize England and Japan and benefit France—all without benefit accruing to American industry or the American people. France would get the benefit of the market which would be taken from the less-favored nations.

Mr. SNELL again said, as late as last Saturday, on the floor.

I would like to change a lot of things in the bill myself and I am not going to get in an argument about the details of the bill.

My friends, it is striking indeed that no argument was made by the gentleman from New York in favor of this particular bill. This is the bill to be considered. The proponents talk in pleasing generalities. In my opinion they have no hope of its consideration and are merely making effort to secure some supposed political advantage in the situation.

For instance, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. COOPER] made a very sincere speech on the floor of the House last Saturday. He was lamenting the tragedy of our industrial communities. Most of his discussion dealt with the importation of Belgian skelp, which is fabricated into steel pipe. He charged that after it was so fabricated, it was sold on the American market in competition with the products of our own steel industry. Then, he referred to the fact that steel bars, tin, and pig iron were being imported into the country from foreign lands. Then he asked the gentleman from Arkansas how he could stand for and justify the importation of such products into our country, which is taking business and work from our American industry and American labor.

Now, I would not be harsh with the gentleman from Ohio, because he is a very distinguished and capable Member of this House, and I can join with him in my desire to see American labor and American industry fairly protected in the onslaught on it from other lands. But the gentleman need not worry about the effect of Belgian skelp imported into this country. In fact, there is such a small amount of it that we have been unable in the limited time to segregate it from other imported articles. However, the Tariff Commission gives us the information that all of the boiler and plate and skelp, together with all other articles described in paragraph 307 of the Smoot-Hawley tariff bill, aggregated 752 tons in the year 1931, with a valuation of \$32,306; that the same imports for 1932 totaled 409 tons, with a value of \$9,088. There is some skelp that was imported under paragraph 308 of the Smoot-Hawley Act, together with other steel products. In 1931 all of the articles in paragraph 308 totaled 10,827 tons, or a valuation of \$416,147. In 1932 all of these commodities, including skelp, aggregated 3,931 tons, with a value of \$100,681. The Tariff Commission gives us the information that very little skelp is imported into this

country. It is plain to see that the total tonnage and the total values are infinitesimal as compared to the total steel production. And if by any stretch of the imagination any effect is felt from their importation, there has been a decrease of 45 per cent in the tonnage of imports under paragraph 307 in 1932 as compared to the preceding year, and a decrease of more than 70 per cent in the value of such imports for like period. With reference to the skelp contained in paragraph 308, supra, we see a reduction of practically 60 per cent in tonnage and almost 80 per cent in value for 1932 over 1931.

The same decrease, both in tonnage and value, which must mean decrease in competition with American products, is found with reference to steel bars. In 1931 steel bars had a value of not over 3½ cents per pound, showing a tonnage of 46,759 tons, valued at \$1,009,223. In 1932 tonnage was reduced to 29,628 tons, with a value of \$488,696. For steel bars valued at 3½ cents and more in 1931 tonnage was 3,259 tons, valued at \$522,393. For 1932 this tonnage had reduced to 1,493 tons, with a value of \$233,058. So by no stretch of the imagination can any condition of the steel industry or any unemployment connected with it come from the depreciated currency of foreign countries.

The quantity and value are clearly indicative that it could not be of material effect upon the steel industry of this country; but if it were, Belgian skelp would not be kept out of this country, nor tariff upon it increased, because Belgium is one of the nations that is on the gold standard and, consequently, is not affected by this bill. This situation obtains with relation to all steel products from Belgium, France, Germany, and other nations who have not depreciated their currency.

We have received a tremendous amount of propaganda relating to rubber shoes. The industry is at low ebb which is blamed on the depreciated currency of other nations. This competition comes from Japan and Czechoslovakia. The record shows that Japan has depreciated her currency while Czechoslovakia has not. Then, the Tariff Commission, just a few days ago, under the flexible provision of the tariff act, increased the tariff on the rubber goods imported from all nations, rather than attempt to set up tariff rates affecting separate nations and different conditions.

With the exception of wood pulp, upon which there is no tariff, and rubber shoes, upon which the Tariff Commission has acted, the imports of tuna fish have been used as a typical case of the effect of depreciated currency in foreign lands. To hear one side of the story, only one conclusion could be reached and that was the depreciation of Japan's yen has spelled the doom of the American canned-tuna-fish industry. But there are other conditions which have entered into and caused the loss of this business to American industry. The demand was created in this country for white tuna fish; our industry purchased it in bulk from Japan; it was shipped here in frozen state and canned by American labor and sold by American industry. Now, here is what happened. Japan is canning her own tuna fish; she is shipping the product that the American people want—the white tuna—in cans. The American industry can not secure white tuna; the best they can do is to get the striped tuna in the Mexican waters and offer it in competition with the preferred article. So, it is apparent that the controlling reason for the disappearance of white tuna as an American product is due to the change in policy by Japan.

Under date of November 30, 1932, Mr. Dow, Commissioner of Customs, wrote the Secretary of Treasury a letter on the depreciated-currencies situation. Incorporated in said letter was a table showing "Comparison of value of imports from countries which have discontinued using the gold standard with those from countries remaining on the gold standard, January to August, 1931 to 1932." This letter was filed in the recent hearings as an exhibit appended to the testimony of Mr. Dow.

To my mind, this is a very descriptive picture of the import situation affecting gold-standard countries, countries off the gold standard, and the other nations of the world. I insert it herewith.

Comparison of value of imports from countries which have discontinued using the gold standard with those from countries remaining on the gold standard, January to August, 1931 and 1932

	Total	Dutiable	Free
Actual value of imports taken as sample, January to August, 1931:			
20 countries off gold standard.....	\$661,036,708	\$145,522,167	\$515,514,541
11 countries on gold standard.....	276,906,254	154,031,961	122,874,293
Actual value of imports from remaining countries, including those imports from above 31 countries which were not taken as a sample.....	510,346,278	194,237,918	316,108,360
Total.....	1,448,289,240	493,792,046	954,497,194
Actual value of imports taken as sample, January to August, 1932:			
20 countries off gold standard.....	421,076,901	86,435,641	334,641,260
11 countries on gold standard.....	182,506,842	95,834,442	86,672,400
Actual value of imports from remaining countries, including those imports from above 31 countries which were not taken as a sample.....	313,717,213	113,624,570	200,092,643
Total.....	917,300,956	295,894,653	621,406,303
Percentage of decrease, January to August, 1931-32:			
20 countries off gold standard.....	36.3	40.6	35.1
11 countries on gold standard.....	34.1	37.8	29.5
Remaining countries.....	38.5	41.5	36.7
Total.....	36.7	40.1	34.9

Summing up, we are thoroughly convinced that the proponents of this measure have utterly failed to make their case.

Mr. COLLIER. Mr. Speaker, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. DOUGHTON].

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Speaker, this extraordinary procedure on a discharge petition in the closing hours of this Congress in an attempt to discharge the Committee on Ways and Means from further consideration of H. R. 8557, the subject of which was being considered by a subcommittee of the Committee on Ways and Means in the ordinary way, is, in my judgment, nothing more nor less than a dying effort on the part of the outgoing administration to embarrass the incoming administration.

If we adopt this discharge rule, you might as well abolish the standing committees of the House. This bill was being considered in the ordinary way. Now we only have 10 minutes to consider one of the most important matters that has or will come before this Congress.

Mr. Speaker, the contention before our subcommittee was to the effect that the imports from countries with a depreciated currency would deluge our country, whereas in 1932 the balance of trade was in our favor and our exports exceeded our imports by \$192,000,000.

If this policy is adopted and carried out, the inevitable result will be the loss of our foreign trade. Not only that, but we will get the ill will of all countries by this narrow, selfish policy.

This proposed legislation is nothing more nor less than an embargo. Another thing, it will greatly cripple American industry, American agriculture, and American labor. It is a narrow and selfish policy. We have already lost much of the friendship of other countries by the iniquitous Smoot-Hawley bill, and we hardly have a friend left in the world.

In 1932 the falling off in imports from countries with depreciated currencies was 6 per cent greater than for those countries on the gold standard. This is one of the most important questions that ever came before Congress, and this is a merely partisan effort or a partisan attempt in the last hours of the Congress to play cheap politics.

Every time the tariff subject is considered or mentioned the gentleman from New York [Mr. CROWTHER] goes into paroxysms. He favors an embargo against the importation of all goods from all countries.

If we are being flooded or overrun with imports from countries with depreciated currencies, as contended, then those same countries are being deluged or trampled under foot by the exportation of goods from our country.

What is behind this unusual move on the part of the minority in the House? Did those responsible for the peti-

tion to discharge the Committee on Ways and Means from further consideration of H. R. 8557, the Crowther bill, entertain the slightest hope that legislation of this character could possibly be enacted into law during the present session of Congress? They did not. It is nothing more nor less than the dying effort, conceived in narrow partisanship, of a discredited Republican administration to embarrass the incoming Democratic administration.

I say this is an unusual procedure, because the minority Members of this body, carrying out the orders of one of their masters, held a conference and agreed upon this program even before the Committee on Ways and Means had begun hearings on this far-reaching proposition, a proposal that is fraught with the gravest consequences not only to many of our own industries but to our international trade as well. Such action is a reflection on the Committee on Ways and Means, which in good faith was preparing to consider the proposed legislation in an orderly way and give it the consideration that such an important question warrants.

Whether the discharge rule is a wise one or not does not enter into the present discussion, but I want to say and warn the House that if such a move as this succeeds, we are establishing a dangerous precedent and we might as well abolish the standing committees of the House and legislate hereafter by petition.

What must Doctor CROWTHER, author of the bill that has been made the vehicle to get this matter before the House, think of this reflection on his well-known embargoism? Is it possible that his colleagues on the Republican side of the House have lost confidence in this high priest of protection and were mistakenly afraid that the evidence brought out in the hearings on this question would cause him to see the light and the inevitable blighting effect such legislation would have on our export trade and international relations?

Mr. SCHAFER. Mr. Speaker, I yield the remainder of my time to the gentleman from New York [Mr. CROWTHER]. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. CHINDBLOM. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman from New York yield?

Mr. CROWTHER. Yes.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. VINSON] was correct when he said that I voted against reporting out this bill (H. R. 8557) last year. At that time I believed, as many people believed, that the depreciated currencies in Europe would result, as usual, in a rise in prices and wages, so that there would be an equalization, ultimately, to compensate for the lower basis or standard of the circulating medium. However, that has not occurred, and there is no sign that it will occur, and I believe now that we should pass this legislation at once.

Mr. Speaker, in extending my remarks, let me add that one of the surprising developments of the present extended deviation from the gold standard of a large part of the civilized world is the continued maintenance of the same level of prices and wages that prevailed before this change occurred. That has resulted in a constantly growing advantage for sales in our markets to the producers of raw materials and the manufacturers of commodities in other countries whose costs of production were below ours even before their debased currencies gave them increased opportunities for successful competition with us. The danger of this competition is not lessened by comparatively diminished imports in some lines. The effect of those imports is to be measured, and has been vastly enlarged by the continued decrease of production and particularly of purchasing power in the United States. There are those who would counteract these effects by a debasement of our own currency. That would be a dangerous and ultimately ruinous stimulation, not a cure. Of course, a theoretical increase of prices, by a lowering of the standard—the American dollar—would not enhance values. It is like making a child believe that it is wealthier having 5 pennies than having only 1 nickel. Two 50-cent dollars are worth no more than one 100-cent dollar.

Mr. Speaker, instead of debasing our own currency, instead of competing with Europe in lowering our standard of

value, let us maintain our higher standard, let us preserve our domestic American markets for our workers, our own farmers, our own producers, our own capital, and our own labor. Therein lies our salvation.

Mr. CROWTHER. Mr. Speaker, ladies and gentlemen of the House, if by any method we could have included a preferential rate in this bill for mohair from Angora goats and rice from Arkansas, we would have had more favorable consideration of this bill from the Democratic side of the House, because I know that the distinguished Speaker of this House is a protectionist at heart. Of course he could not say anything about it in the last campaign. He did not go out with the show-boat troupe for fear that he might rock the boat.

The gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. RAGON] appears to be the spokesman for the opponents of this legislation. At least he acted in that capacity last Saturday. I have a very high regard for his intellectual attainments and legislative capability, but sometimes I fear, as I watch him in action, that he is misled and mistakes perspiration for inspiration. One wonders when he has time to think. My friend from Arkansas finds great solace and comfort in quoting the statements of Chairman O'Brien, of the Tariff Commission, against this policy. Even if the entire Democratic membership is so comforted it does not lessen the asininity of Mr. O'Brien's statements the fraction of a degree.

The gentleman from Arkansas says that we are placing a shroud on the poor old Republican Party. Oh, yes; the party is old, and just at present we are poor, but we are not yet ready for a shroud. There has been no count of 10 following the knockout blow in November last, and we are here ready to fight for the retention of the policy of a protective tariff as part of our national economic program. [Applause on Republican side.]

The theory advanced by the opponents of this bill is that American prices have been so reduced that an adjustment of tariff rates based on par value of foreign currencies would raise the rates to an unwarrantable degree. The Secretary of Commerce states that:

In no instance has the increase in foreign wholesale prices, in terms of foreign currency, been sufficient to offset the effects or depreciation in exchange, even making allowances for the decline of United States prices.

The Hawley-Smoot rates were written as competitive rates. They never were highly protective, and under existing conditions they are not now even competitive. No scaling ladders are necessary to get over our tariff wall. Depreciated currencies have opened the gates wide, and as a reception committee in the receiving line you find the Democrats and the importers and the international bankers all saying, "Welcome, little stranger," to the freight liners that bring in the commodities that ought to be now made by our own people in our own factories in the United States. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Depreciated currencies have brought about a condition in this country that the Democrats do not dare to try to develop by keeping their promises of reducing tariff rates which they made in the last campaign.

The gentleman from Arkansas said the other day that the Democrats won the campaign on the tariff issue. They never won a campaign in this country directly on the tariff issue. It was won by capitalizing the misery of the unemployed, by promising a job to 10,000,000 unemployed after March 4, by promising to repeal the eighteenth amendment, by promising to bring back beer and light wines immediately, and not on the tariff issue. If the campaign had been fought out solely on the tariff issue, the Democrats never would have reached first base.

The distinguished leader on the Democratic side [Mr. RAINEY] said on the floor of this House on January 9, 1932:

We do not want this country flooded with the products of cheap labor in other countries.

How will your action to-day square with that statement of his? My Democratic friends seem to have lost interest in American workmen. Any reference to the policy of protec-

tion to American industry and labor is studiously avoided in the Democratic platform. "A competitive tariff for revenue" is your declaration. "Avaunt protection! and quit our sight" is the entrance cue for the "new deal."

It is the same old Democratic Party, gentlemen, demagoguing its way through the pages of history, forever carrying water in a sieve, always rolling a stone uphill, always disappointed in its hopes, because it has not the integrity to be honest with itself nor the capacity to keep faith with the American people. [Applause on the Republican side.]

The SPEAKER. The question is, Shall the Committee on Ways and Means be discharged from the further consideration of the bill H. R. 8557?

Mr. SCHAFER. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 174, nays 212, answered "present" 2, not voting 39, as follows:

[Roll No. 159]
YEAS—174

Adkins	Crall	Jenkins	Sanders, N. Y.
Aldrich	Crowther	Johnson, Wash.	Schafer
Allen	Culkin	Kading	Seger
Andresen	Curry	Kahn	Selvig
Andrew, Mass.	Darrow	Kelly, Pa.	Shott
Andrews, N. Y.	Davis, Pa.	Ketcham	Simmons
Arentz	De Priest	Kinzer	Sinclair
Bacharach	Doutrich	Knutson	Snell
Bachmann	Dowell	Kopp	Snow
Bacon	Dyer	Kurtz	Stalker
Baldrige	Eaton, Colo.	Lankford, Va.	Stokes
Barbour	Eaton, N. J.	Leavitt	Strong, Kans.
Beck	Englebright	Lehlbach	Strong, Pa.
Beedy	Erk	Loofbourov	Stull
Biddle	Estep	Lovette	Summers, Wash.
Bohn	Evans, Calif.	Luce	Swanson
Boileau	Foss	McClintock, Ohio	Swick
Bolton	Frear	McFadden	Swing
Bowman	Free	McLeod	Taber
Brand, Ohio	Freeman	Maas	Taylor, Tenn.
Britten	French	Manlove	Temple
Buckbee	Garber	Mapes	Thatcher
Burdick	Gibson	Martin, Mass.	Thurston
Burtness	Gifford	Martin, Oreg.	Timberlake
Cable	Goodwin	Michener	Turpin
Campbell, Iowa	Goss	Millard	Underhill
Campbell, Pa.	Hadley	Moore, Ohio	Watson
Carter, Calif.	Hall, Ill.	Mouser	Watson
Carter, Wyo.	Hall, N. Dak.	Murphy	Weeks
Cavicchia	Hancock, N. Y.	Nelson, Me.	Welch
Chindblom	Hardy	Niedringhaus	White
Chiperfield	Hartley	Nolan	Whitley
Christopherson	Hess	Parker, N. Y.	Wigglesworth
Clague	Hill, Wash.	Partridge	Williamson
Clancy	Hogg, Ind.	Perkins	Withrow
Clarke, N. Y.	Hogg, W. Va.	Pittenger	Wolcott
Cochran, Pa.	Holiday	Pratt, Harcourt J.	Wolfenden
Cole, Iowa	Hollister	Purnell	Wolverton
Colton	Holmes	Ramseyer	Wood, Ind.
Connery	Hooper	Ransley	Woodruff
Connolly	Horr	Reed, N. Y.	Wyant
Cooke	Houston, Del.	Rich	Yates
Cooper, Ohio	Hull, William E.	Robinson	
Coyle	James	Rogers, Mass.	

NAYS—212

Abernethy	Chavez	Eslick	Hull, Morton D.
Allgood	Christgau	Evans, Mont.	Jacobsen
Almon	Clark, N. C.	Fernandez	Jeffers
Amle	Cochran, Mo.	Fiesinger	Johnson, Mo.
Arnold	Cole, Md.	Fishburne	Johnson, Okla.
Auf der Heide	Collier	Fitzpatrick	Johnson, Tex.
Ayres	Collins	Flannagan	Jones
Barton	Condon	Fulbright	Keller
Beam	Cooper, Tenn.	Fuller	Kelly, Ill.
Black	Corning	Fulmer	Kemp
Bland	Cox	Gambrill	Kennedy, Md.
Blanton	Cross	Gavagan	Kennedy, N. Y.
Bloom	Crowe	Gilchrist	Kerr
Boehne	Crump	Gillen	Kleberg
Boland	Cullen	Glover	Kniffin
Boylan	Davis, Tenn.	Goldsborough	Kunz
Briggs	Delaney	Granfield	Kvale
Browning	DeRouen	Greenwood	LaGuardia
Brunner	Dickinson	Gregory	Lambertson
Buchanan	Dickstein	Griffin	Lambeth
Bulwinkle	Dies	Griswold	Lamneck
Burch	Dieterich	Guyer	Lanham
Busby	Disney	Haines	Lankford, Ga.
Byrns	Dominick	Hare	Larrabee
Canfield	Douglas, Ariz.	Harlan	Lea
Cannon	Douglass, Mass.	Hart	Lewis
Carden	Doxey	Hastings	Lichtenwalner
Carley	Drane	Hill, Ala.	Lindsay
Cary	Drewry	Hoch	Lonergan
Castellow	Driver	Hope	Lozier
Celler	Eagle	Howard	Ludlow
Chapman	Ellzey	Huddleston	McClintic, Okla.

McCormack	Norton, N. J.	Reilly	Sutphin
McDuffie	O'Connor	Rogers, N. H.	Swank
McGugin	Oliver, Ala.	Romjue	Tarver
McKeown	Oliver, N. Y.	Rudd	Taylor, Colo.
McMillan	Owen	Sabath	Thomason
McReynolds	Palmisano	Sanders, Tex.	Tierney
McSwain	Parker, Ga.	Sandlin	Underwood
Major	Parks	Schneider	Vinson, Ga.
Mansfield	Parsons	Schuetz	Vinson, Ky.
May	Patman	Shallenberger	Warren
Mead	Patterson	Sirovich	Weaver
Miller	Peavey	Smith, Va.	West
Milligan	Pettengill	Smith, W. Va.	Whittington
Mitchell	Polk	Sparks	Williams, Mo.
Mobley	Pou	Spence	Williams, Tex.
Montet	Prall	Stafford	Wilson
Moore, Ky.	Ragon	Stegall	Wingo
Morehead	Rainey	Stevenson	Wood, Ga.
Nelson, Mo.	Ramspeck	Stewart	Woodrum
Nelson, Wis.	Rankin	Sullivan, N. Y.	Wright
Norton, Nebr.	Rayburn	Summers, Tex.	Yon

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—2

Crosser Doughton

NOT VOTING—39

Bankhead	Gilbert	Johnson, Ill.	Seiberling
Brand, Ga.	Golder	Johnson, S. Dak.	Shannon
Brumm	Green	Larsen	Shreve
Cartwright	Hall, Miss.	Magrady	Smith, Idaho
Chase	Hancock, N. C.	Maloney	Somers, N. Y.
Davenport	Haugen	Montague	Sullivan, Pa.
Finley	Hawley	Overton	Sweeney
Fish	Hopkins	Person	Tinkham
Flood	Hornor	Pratt, Ruth	Treadway
Gasque	Igoe	Reid, Ill.	

So the motion was rejected.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Hawley (for) with Mr. Doughton (against).
 Mr. Seiberling (for) with Mr. Crosser (against).
 Mr. Magrady (for) with Mr. Brand of Georgia (against).
 Mr. Hopkins (for) with Mr. Shannon (against).
 Mr. Fish (for) with Mr. Green (against).
 Mr. Shreve (for) with Mr. Cartwright (against).
 Mr. Reid of Illinois (for) with Mr. Maloney (against).
 Mr. Treadway (for) with Mr. Montague (against).
 Mrs. Pratt (for) with Mr. Bankhead (against).
 Mr. Smith of Idaho (for) with Mr. Igoe (against).
 Mr. Golder (for) with Mr. Larsen (against).
 Mr. Haugen (for) with Mr. Hornor (against).
 Mr. Davenport (for) with Mr. Hancock of North Carolina (against).
 Mr. Person (for) with Mr. Gasque (against).
 Mr. Brumm (for) with Mr. Sweeney (against).
 Mr. Johnson of South Dakota (for) with Mr. Overton (against).
 Mr. Tinkham (for) with Mr. Somers of New York (against).
 Mr. Sullivan of Pennsylvania (for) with Mr. Flood (against).
 Mr. Finley (for) with Mr. Gilbert (against).
 Mr. Chase (for) with Mr. Hall of Mississippi (against).

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, my colleague, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, is unavoidably absent. If present, he would vote "no."

Mr. RAINEY. Mr. Speaker, I wish to announce that the gentleman from Florida, Mr. GREEN, is unavoidably detained on account of illness in his family. If present, he would vote "no."

Mr. CROSSER. Mr. Speaker, I have a pair with the gentleman from Ohio, Mr. SEIBERLING; but if I were permitted to vote I would vote "no."

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Speaker, I have a pair with the gentleman from Oregon, Mr. HAWLEY. If present, the gentleman from Oregon would vote "aye," and if I were permitted to vote I would vote "no."

Mr. BRITTEN. Mr. Speaker, my colleague, the gentleman from Illinois, Mr. REID, is unavoidably detained. If present, he would vote "aye."

Mr. FRENCH. Mr. Speaker, my colleague the gentleman from Idaho, Mr. SMITH, is detained from the Chamber on account of illness. If present, he would vote "aye."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

On motion by Mr. COLLIER, a motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill was rejected was laid on the table.

EQUALIZATION OF TARIFF DUTIES—EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. ANDREW of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, this measure has to do with one of the most serious obstacles to world recovery. The abandonment of the world's common standard of value by some thirty-odd countries has brought a factor of uncertainty and instability into all international trade. But worse than that the depreciation of foreign currencies has cut us off from many profitable foreign markets for our

raw materials and manufactures. As the gold exchange value of their currencies has declined, foreign prices translated into gold have declined and the profit of our export trade has been wiped out. In consequence, our exports have diminished and the unemployment situation in this country has grown steadily worse. There is no legislation that we can adopt which will remedy this curtailment of our foreign market.

But an even more disastrous consequence of the foreign currency situation has befallen us in our own markets, where products of foreign origin are enabled to be sold at greatly reduced prices, without reducing the profits of foreign competitors in terms of their local currencies. This situation, which is driving many American undertakings to the wall, and depriving hundreds of thousands of our people of their usual means of livelihood, can be remedied by such legislation as is proposed in the Crowther and Hill bills, and we shall be negligent of our trust as representatives of the American people, if we refuse to consider it.

There can be no question that in many lines of industry, every vestige of protection hitherto provided by the Congress has been more than offset by this plague of depreciating exchange. In Japan the currency has depreciated by nearly 60 per cent, in England by 30 per cent, in the Scandinavian countries by similar percentages. This means that whatever protective tariffs we have established have been rendered wholly ineffective, and that the products of these countries can be dumped in our market at prices reduced by a third or a half below their former level, and yet their sale yields the foreign producers the same profits as before.

I want to speak particularly of the fishing industry, of which I can speak from personal knowledge, as the majority of the people in the community where I live have for three centuries drawn their living from the sea. At first glance it may seem strange, but it is none the less true, that the fishermen of New England find themselves to-day in dire straits because of the falling value of the yen in Japan, the krone in Norway, and the pound in Great Britain.

The New England fishermen have been hard hit by this situation. It has made it possible for Japanese swordfish to be frozen and shipped across the Pacific, through the canal, and landed in Boston at far less than half the normal American market price. The Gloucester sword fishermen have thus been practically driven out of business by the fall of the Japanese yen. Similarly, boneless codfish packed in Japan is being sold throughout the Middle West at little more than half its cost of production in Gloucester. Despite a protective tariff, kippered herring from England is being sold in our own market at less than the Gloucester cost of production. Likewise sardines from Norway and Portugal are driving the Maine canneries to the wall. In a word, because of depreciated currency abroad, our fishing industry to-day is far worse off than it would be if we were operating under free trade under normal currency conditions. What is true of the fishing industry is true of many other of our New England industries, notably the manufacture of cutlery, rubber footwear, wood pulp, electric-light bulbs, and many of our textiles.

While we can not protect our export trade against the declining profit due to foreign depreciation, we can do something to protect our domestic market from abnormal competition due to this cause. The Hill bill and the Crowther bill point the way. They do not seek to increase tariff duties but to prevent these duties from being completely wiped out in a moment when our own people particularly need and are entitled to see them maintained. The element of time is of the highest importance. Every week that we delay sees American industries driven out of existence and American workmen forced into the ranks of the unemployed for the sole benefit of foreign competitors. The party that assumes the responsibility of delaying or estopping the consideration of these measures at this time must bear a heavy load of blame. For it evidences its willingness to sacrifice the people of the United States for the advantage of those of Great Britain and the countries of continental Europe and the Orient in one of the gravest periods of our history.

Mr. HAUGEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend remarks in the RECORD, I desire to offer a few observations on depreciated currency, and its effect on the tariff. There has recently been brought to my attention a statement by Mr. Fred H. Sexauer, president of the Dairyman's League Cooperative Association, relative to depreciated currency and the effect on butter prices in the United States, which appeared in the January edition of the Creamery Journal, part of which I quote as follows:

So long as England and other European countries remain on a monetary system wherein their money unit comparable to the American dollar is of lower gold value than that of the United States, butter can not attain a price much higher than 25 cents on the New York market. * * *

Just why the English monetary system, which at present values gold on a ratio of about 14 grains to \$1, as against the United States 23.22 grains per dollar, should so affect butter prices in this country may not be evident to the casual observer. However, it was well illustrated just recently when it checked an upward movement of butter prices and broke the market. * * *

A situation existed that was promising for the dairy industry. Suddenly the upward movement was checked and prices broke. New Zealand butter, which had not been entering the United States, was suddenly able to jump the 14-cent tariff wall and come into competition with the domestic product. The New Zealand butter shipper, who had been selling in England at about 19 cents on the English money basis, equal to 12 cents on the United States gold basis, found it more profitable to ship to this country despite the tariff. * * *

In other words, because of the difference in quantity of gold between the present monetary systems of England and the United States, the country's dollar increases in value to about \$1.47 when converted into English money. Thus New Zealand was able to sell butter on the Pacific coast at a price that paid the tariff, covered shipping, and left a larger profit than if the product had been shipped to England. * * *

This entry of New Zealand butter quickly broke the market for domestic butter. It is evident that so long as the gold value of England's money and that of the United States continue at the present wide difference butter prices can not advance here. Anytime such prices do increase the New Zealand product will again be attracted.

The letter of transmittal also has the following statement:

In order to bring agriculture back to a pre-war basis it will become necessary for us to do something to adjust the value of money. This article shows that even with a 14-cent tariff on butter, it is not working at the present time, because of the variation in valuation of money between the different countries. * * *

The depreciated currency of the 28 nations that have gone off the gold standard has had a most damaging effect on American industries. It has enabled the competitors to buy on the world market, paying for the commodities with depreciated currency of less than two-thirds the value of the United States currency based on gold. The foreign depreciated dollar, which at present values gold on a ratio of about 14 grains to \$1, as against the United States 23.22 grains per dollar fine gold (25.8 grains of gold, nine-tenths fine), has enabled the importer to exchange two American dollars for better than three depreciated dollars, and to buy three times as much butter than if payment of our standard dollar were required, and thus enables him, as stated, to jump over the 14-cent tariff wall and come into competition with our domestic product. Hence, it has not only destroyed the value of European currency but the price of their commodities as well. The depreciation by more than one-third in the value of the currency, as pointed out by Mr. Sexauer, has enabled the importer to jump the 14-cent tariff wall, thus lowering the price of butter, as well as other commodities, to the extent of one-third the value of the dollar. Not only that but it has demonstrated the value of the protective tariff to American industry. At present, with depreciated currency, the tariff is ineffective to the extent of the difference between 19 cents English currency and 12 cents in United States currency, or 7 cents a pound. It is needless to say, if—as stated by Mr. Sexauer, New Zealand butter can come into our markets and sell in competition with domestic products, even after paying 14-cent tariff—if it were not for the 14-cent tariff, it could be laid down in New York at 14 cents less than the price of 19 cents in European currency, equal to 12 cents in United States currency, plus 1½ cents freight, net 13½ cents f. o. b. New York, instead of, as stated by Mr. Sexauer, the price now being 19 cents

European currency, equal to 12 cents American currency plus 14 cents tariff, or 26 cents. In other words, it would reduce the current price of butter approximately one-half.

By all means legislation should at least be enacted to collect the difference at the customhouse as a surtax or countervailing tax on the imports of the difference between the par value and the depreciated value on the day of entry, rather than chop off one-third or more of the standard gold dollar, which would give us more dollars, but unfortunately of more than one-third less value, and as a result the many millions of dollars payable in gold, which would unless one-third or more of the obligation is to be discounted, it would require more than \$3 to discharge the obligation of \$2. According to world quotations foreign and domestic producers operating under depreciated currency receive no more dollars than do domestic producers, as stated by Mr. Sexauer, "New Zealand butter selling in England at about 19 cents in English money, equal to 12 cents in United States," as compared with from 17 cents to 23 cents during the last few months here at the creameries, or as stated by Mr. Sexauer, "at the top price of 26 cents in New York."

Producers of wheat in Canada sell their wheat, much of it, at 10 cents a bushel less than producers on the American side. The Canadian dollar of to-day is quoted at 84.2045. This matter was brought vividly to my attention last October when disposing of 47 bushels of wheat grown in North Dakota, only a few miles this side of the Canadian line, which sold at 42½ cents, or \$19.97. According to quotations in the Chicago Daily Tribune on October 1, 1932, the price on the Canadian side was a trifle above 29 cents. Over there my 47 bushels of wheat would have brought only \$13.63, less Canadian exchange of \$1.36, net \$12.23, or \$7.77 less than the amount, or approximately 16½ cents a bushel less than what I received on the American side. In paying my taxes in Canada, amounting to \$57.15 on a piece of land, I paid by draft of \$52.72. On these small transactions my gain in selling on the American side on the wheat was \$7.77, and my gain in paying taxes in Canada with American currency was \$4.53.

Mexico is on the silver basis. Its dollars are worth only one-half as much as ours. A recent foreign exchange quotes it at 28.5833. I recall many years ago exchanging \$100 in American currency and receiving \$404 in Mexican dollars, and dollars containing more silver than ours.

Considering quotations and experience in foreign countries with depreciated currency, although the cheap dollar might discharge obligations not payable in gold and buy as much of the commodities as our good dollars, it seems to me that to permit the payment for agricultural commodities or the payment of debts by cheap dollars is on the border line of repudiation.

Section 311 of the Code of Laws of the United States provides for the continuance of the parity in value of the coins of gold and silver and the equal power of every dollar at all times in the market and in the payment of debts. Section 314 provides that the standard dollar, consisting of 25.8 grains of gold nine-tenths fine, shall be the standard unit of value and all forms of money issued or coined by the United States shall be maintained at a parity of value with this standard, and it shall be the duty of the Secretary of the Treasury to maintain such parity. Section 408 provides that the United States notes, Treasury notes, and so forth, when presented to the Treasurer for redemption shall be redeemed in gold coin of the standard fixed.

The question is, Can the suggested dollar of 14 ounces of gold be made to equal the value of the one containing 25.8 grains of gold nine-tenths fine, and be made of equal power in the payment of debts without impairing existing contracts? The Constitution provides that no person shall be deprived of life, liberty, or property without due process of law, and the fifth amendment provides that private property shall not be taken for public use without just compensation.

Can Congress cut off one-third of the gold of the present gold dollar and declare it to be on a parity and of equal value with the former dollar containing one-third more gold with impunity?

I can not become reconciled to the fact that if I borrowed from my neighbor 100 bushels of wheat of 60 pounds to the bushel, or 6,000 pounds, that by Congress changing the standard to 40 pounds to the bushel, that I would be discharging my obligation to my neighbor by tendering to him 4,000 pounds. Or if I borrowed \$100 based on 23.22 grains of gold, that by Congress changing the standard to 14 grains that I would be discharging my obligation by tendering \$100 containing one-third less gold. One thing I do know—were I permitted to melt \$100 gold containing 23.22 grains of gold to the dollar and run it through the mint I would be approximately \$35 ahead or long on gold, and my neighbor would be just that much short.

One thing is certain, that in the absence of a protective tariff to protect American industry and labor against importation of foreign products, it would place the American producer and labor on a level with foreign labor and producers. Considering it all, it seems to me that rather than to substitute cheap dollars for good dollars, the better way out of the difficulty would be to require the collection of the difference at the customhouse as a surtax, or as a countervailing tax on the imports of the difference between the value of our dollar and the depreciated value of the depreciated currency, or to raise the tariff or, if need be, set up an embargo.

Fortunately, we are and have been enjoying the highest standard of living in the world. Personally, I believe in maintaining it. One way of maintaining our high standard of living is by protecting our markets from flooding by products produced at a lower cost and under lower standards of living. In my opinion, the practical way of maintaining our high standard of living and high wages is to insure employment and protection to American labor and American producers and every worthy and legitimate enterprise against the importation of products produced by underpaid labor under lower standards of living—in short, a tariff for the common good of all American people.

However, bearing in mind that in the case of a surplus in excess of the domestic requirements the tariff is ineffective and the price obtained for the surplus on the world market establishes the price of the whole production. It is needless to say that the tariff, by all means, must be also made effective. For example, notwithstanding the tariff already fixed by the Tariff Commission is 14 cents on butter, as stated by Mr. Sexauer, butter is still being imported. The Hawley-Smoot bill increased the tariff on livestock of less than 700 pounds from 1½ cents to 2½ cents; over 700 pounds, from 2 to 3 cents; beef was increased from 3 to 6 cents; swine was increased from ½ cent to 2 cents; hams and bacon and shoulders were increased from 2 to 3½ cents; milk from 2½ cents to 5½ cents per gallon, and cream was increased from 20 cents to 56.06 cents per gallon.

Cattle are coming across the Canadian line in large numbers, and Canadian hams and bacon, advertised as such, are now served at medium-class restaurants in Washington. Certainly the Iowa farmer, tilling his farm valued at many times the price of foreign highly productive soil, and paying high wages, can not compete with products produced by underpaid foreign labor on lower-priced land equal in productivity, much of it selling at one-quarter to one-tenth of the American price, nor can the American wage earner, receiving the highest wage in the world, measured by the purchasing power of from two to six times more than those of the European countries, compete with foreign labor, nor can the American farmer, with existing disparity in prices of agricultural commodities, employ labor at an American wage, pay taxes and debts, even with deflated currency, nor can it, under the present conditions, be done even by cutting the interest rate in two. As everybody knows, there are millions of farmers at present who are unable to pay their taxes, much less interest, even though the rate be lowered. Certainly it can not be done by lowering their prices and standard of living to that of Russia and other nations' with lower prices and standards of living.

My contention has been, and I still adhere to it, that the most effective way of starting not only the farmer, but labor

and every worthy and legitimate industry back on the highway of prosperity, is to first protect American industry and labor against the importation of foreign products, made at lower cost and under lower standards of living, by a tariff; and second, by making that tariff effective so as to establish and maintain advantageous domestic markets, as provided in the McNary-Haugen bill, passed two times by the Senate and House, or if the tariff is not made the yardstick, the ratio price, a ratio price equivalent to the pre-war prices for the years 1905 to 1914, or as suggested by some, the cost price plus a reasonable profit would afford well-deserved relief. In other words, to rehabilitate agriculture, through the redemption of the often repeated party platform pledges to restore equality between agriculture, labor, and industry. If so, we shall have restored confidence in men and party platform pledges.

Then, and not until then, will hunger, privation, and agony, and the heart-rending worry over the loss of the old homestead, so near and dear to young and old, the closing of banks, the receivership of railroads and long-established worthy and legitimate enterprises, and the deflation process and demand for depreciated currency be stopped.

Mother Earth is the producer of new wealth. The only way I know of creating new wealth is through the application of energy and labor to bring forth the treasures of Mother Earth. The farmer by his labor affords the opportunity for the sun, rain, and soil to bring into existence the essentials of life—the food we eat and the clothes we wear. With railroads rusting from idleness, factories and mills crumbling, and millions of men and women out of employment, it must be clear to all with absolute finality that the stability, growth, and greatness of our Nation depend upon the prosperity of the tillers of the soil.

It is needless to say that if the party platform pledges are redeemed, and when the existing disparity is overcome and parity is restored, there will be no need for 50 or 60 cent dollars; if so, tax receipts will be substituted for tax deeds, satisfaction of mortgages will be recorded in place of sheriff's deeds, pay checks will be substituted for meal tickets, rent receipts will take the place of eviction notices, teachers will be the proud possessors of certified checks instead of warrants indorsed "refused on account of no funds;" ministers' salaries will be paid in currency instead of in promises, banks will honor checks presented, merchants will receive orders for and payment for goods, and although late, better late than never; tranquillity, cheer, happiness, and jollification meetings will take the place of sheriff's sales and protest meetings, farmers' and laborers' strikes, evictions, bread lines, and the call for charity.

Mr. REILLY. Mr. Speaker, on many occasions prior to and since the election I have expressed the judgment that tariff duties should be levied on imports into our country to offset whatever advantages a depreciated currency may give to industry in countries that have gone off the gold standard.

In the recent Democratic House caucus held for the purpose of considering my party's attitude regarding the Crowther bill, designed to increase existing tariff rates on articles imported into this country from countries having a depreciated currency, and also to levy a tariff duty on articles now on the free list imported from such countries, I asked for and got permission from the caucus to differ from the majority of my colleagues in the House and to vote in favor of the consideration of the Crowther bill when it should come before the House on the petition to discharge the committee from further consideration of the bill, in the event my study of the bill and the hearings should justify me in so voting.

As a result of my study of the Crowther bill and the hearings on the bill, I have come to the conclusion that the bill should not be approved by the House.

The Crowther bill provides for the levying of additional tariff duties on articles imported into our country from countries having a depreciated currency of more than 5 per cent, the tariff duties to be equal to the percentage of depreciation of the currency in the exporting countries.

This bill also provides for the levying of similar tariff duties on articles now on the free list imported from countries having a depreciated currency.

On the hearing on the Crowther bill before the Ways and Means Committee, three members of the Tariff Commission, including Mr. O'Brien, the chairman of the commission and a high-tariff Republican, appeared and opposed its passage.

Mr. O'Brien testified that our imports to-day are at a very low ebb, both in quantity and price; that there is still a very heavy balance of trade in our favor, both in quantity and value. All the members of the Tariff Commission testified that there was no flooding of our market from countries operating under a depreciated currency, and that a depreciated currency gave no advantage to the industries in countries off the gold standard as regards their exports into our country, except a temporary advantage that speedily adjusts itself.

Last October President Hoover ordered the Tariff Commission to investigate the matter of increased importations into our country from countries off the gold standard.

The Tariff Commission reports that imports to our country are falling off; that the imports during the fiscal year 1932 from countries off the gold standard decreased in a greater percentage than the imports into our country, during the same period, from countries on the gold standard.

One of the functions of the Tariff Commission is to investigate trade conditions for the purpose of recommending to the President changes in tariff rates when in the judgment of the commission such changes are necessary.

Since last October the commission has been investigating the question of an effect of depreciated currency on imports into our country, and only recently the commission ordered an increase of tariff duties on rubber goods coming from countries on and off the gold standard. The commission is still at work on this line of investigation.

Doctor Durand, chief economist of the Tariff Commission, says that the Crowther bill would raise a tariff embargo in our country against all the world.

Sixty-seven per cent of our imports are now on the free list. The passage of the Crowther bill would put thousands of these articles on the dutiable list and would raise our tariff wall from about an average rate of 16 per cent to more than double that rate.

I can not vote for the consideration of this bill for the reason that I must take the findings and judgment of the Tariff Commission as to the wisdom and necessity of such legislation, and for the further reason that I am not willing to attempt to frame on the floor of this House a tariff bill automatic in its operations, that would result in tariff rates, that would put the rates of the Hawley-Smoot bill to shame.

The passage of this bill would result in our country levying different tariff rates on the same article exported from different countries, a situation that might lead to international misunderstandings, and to feeling on the part of some countries that we were discriminating against them through the levying of tariff duties.

France a few years ago depreciated her franc 80 per cent. France to-day is on the gold standard and her exports to our country under the pending bill would not be subject to any raise in tariff duties, while England and Canada, two of our best customers, would have to pay higher duties.

The pending bill is an unscientific and unworkable measure, designed to fix tariff rates without any regard to the cost of production, the only scientific basis upon which to write a tariff bill.

Again, from the testimony of the Tariff Commissioners, it would appear that our industries, if they are threatened to-day with disastrous foreign competition, that threat is just as great, if not greater, from countries operating on the gold standard as from countries having a depreciated currency, yet this bill would give no relief from imports coming from countries on the gold standard.

Many communications have come to my desk regarding the pending bill, particularly as its terms would affect wood pulp. About half of these communications declare that if a tariff is not placed on wood pulp the wood-pulp plants will

have to close, and the other half insist that if a tariff is placed on wood pulp the paper mills will have to close.

Such advice, to say the least, is confusing to a lawmaker, and as a result I feel obligated to follow the judgment of the Tariff Commission.

It is possible that because of changing economic conditions at home and abroad, it may become necessary to levy higher tariff duties on articles now dutiable, and to levy new duties on articles now on the free list, but Congress is in no position to enter upon such tariff changes until it has the information upon which to base such legislation, and that information should come from the Tariff Commission.

Mr. LANKFORD of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I am opposed to the motion to discharge the Ways and Means Committee from the consideration of H. R. 8557, known as the Crowther bill. I do not favor exercising the harsh discharge rule except in extreme cases. I certainly am opposed to its exercise in this case.

I feel that the Ways and Means Committee should be allowed to make a most exhaustive study of this bill and its far-reaching provisions. In fact, I am opposed to the bill in its present form. I feel that this entire matter should be worked out by a bill dealing with the tariff in its entirety.

To my mind this bill if enacted into law would not help our people as a whole. It is not such a bill as should be passed under whip and spur and without the most careful consideration.

I would much prefer to pass at once a bill to inflate our own currency, both in volume and amount, to offset the effect of the inflation of currency in other countries instead of attempting to get this result by the passage of the Crowther bill.

I can not at all subscribe to the proposition that either the present bill or a general tariff bill or any other similar measure will bring back real permanent prosperity until there is a proper inflation of the circulation of our currency both in volume and amount. This accompanied by a proper adjustment of the indebtedness of our people and a real farm-relief program will usher in real and permanent prosperity.

Let us remove the causes of the depression and the effects will improve. All the bad effects of the depression, though, can never be fully overcome any more than all who die in an epidemic of physical disease can be brought back to life. This is why I have been so anxious all these months and years for Congress to pass some legislation to stop loan foreclosures, help our farmers get better prices, save the homes of our people, and give them another chance in life's battle.

UNITED STATES GEORGIA BICENTENNIAL COMMISSION

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 518) establishing the United States Georgia Bicentennial Commission, and for other purposes, and I ask that the Clerk may read the joint resolution for information.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the joint resolution.

The Clerk read as follows:

House Joint Resolution 518

Resolved, etc., That there is hereby established a commission, to be known as the United States Georgia Bicentennial Commission, for the purpose of participation by the United States in the observance of the two-hundredth anniversary of the founding of the Georgia Colony, such commission to be composed of 21 commissioners, as follows: Nine persons to be appointed by the President of the United States; 6 Senators to be appointed by the President of the Senate, and 6 Members of the House of Representatives to be appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives. The members of the commission shall serve without compensation, and shall select a chairman from among their number.

Sec. 2. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of \$5,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary, to be expended by the commission established by this resolution for actual and necessary traveling expenses and subsistence while discharging its official duties outside the District of Columbia.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out section 2.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the joint resolution?

Mr. SNELL. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. PURNELL. Reserving the right to object, I wish to get some information about this. Is the gentleman asking unanimous consent to pass the resolution?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman asks unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the joint resolution.

Mr. STAFFORD. Reserving the right to object.

Mr. SNELL. Reserving the right to object, I want to get a little information in regard to the resolution. I am not sure whether I shall object to it or not. I want to make my position clear to the House. I have at all times opposed legislation of this character, and it does seem to me that to bring up a resolution establishing a commission of 21 members to prepare for a celebration down in Georgia at this time is a needless expense to the Government. If there is not to be any expense connected with this, why is it to be done under the authority of the United States commission? We have been through this several times. The same statement has been made on the floor of the House that "We want the Government to take supervision of this, give its name and influence to it, but we are not going to ask for any appropriation." That has been done time and time again, but after we have assumed responsibility for it, then the people who are connected with the celebration come here and ask the Government to appropriate money. They say, "The Government must do this. The Government has assumed responsibility, and they must make some appropriation to carry out that work." I think the Speaker of the House has always taken the same position on this proposition that I have. I dislike to object to the resolution offered by the gentleman or the consideration of it, but I want it definitely known that this is no time to start any new celebrations at the expense of the American people. [Applause.]

The SPEAKER. Will the House permit the Chair to make a statement? The Chair has taken this matter up with the gentleman from New York, and the gentleman from New York has stated the position of the Chair exactly. Two or three gentlemen from Georgia, however, have stated they would not ask for any additional appropriation aside from the \$1,000 contained in the resolution passed by the Senate, and that the celebration is to end next September. Those gentlemen have given assurance that they will not ask for any additional appropriation. They are Members of this Congress, and they are Members of the next Congress. Taking that for granted, the Chair thought he could recognize them under the circumstances just stated.

Mr. PURNELL. Reserving the right to object, as I remember the statement made by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. Cox] before the Committee on Rules, even the sum of \$1,000 was not to be requested.

Mr. COX. The Committee on Rules struck out section 2, which carried an appropriation of \$5,000.

Mr. PURNELL. So that as the resolution is now before the House, it carries no appropriation?

Mr. COX. The Senate had previously passed Senate Joint Resolution 223, which carried an appropriation of \$1,000. I did state to the Rules Committee that the Georgia delegation would not ask for any appropriation whatsoever. I can appreciate the fact that the objection to resolutions of this character is that they usually call for money out of the Public Treasury.

The SPEAKER. Is it the purpose of the gentleman from Georgia to ask unanimous consent to consider the Senate resolution, if permission is granted to consider the resolution at all?

Mr. COX. I intended to ask unanimous consent that Senate Joint Resolution 223 be substituted for House Joint Resolution 518, with the understanding that section 2 would be stricken out.

Mr. SNELL. Reserving the right to object, I want a little further information. I appreciate what the gentleman has said and I have no doubt he does not intend to ask for any appropriation, but I know what the pressure will be on the Georgia delegation by the people back home as soon as this is adopted to get some appropriation from the Congress to meet the expenses.

Who is going to pay the expenses of this commission of 21 members?

Mr. COX. If there is any participation the commission will have to pay its own expenses. I may say in answer to the gentleman's inquiry that I know a majority of the House delegation have stated they would not ask for any appropriation whatsoever. Speaking for myself, I shall oppose any effort to get any appropriation of any character in connection with this commission.

Mr. SNELL. Can the gentleman give us that assurance on behalf of the Georgia delegation in the next session of Congress?

Mr. COX. I am sure I can.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. The gentleman is speaking for this member of the Georgia delegation also.

Mr. SNELL. If I have correctly stated the understanding, I shall not object.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. That is the understanding, that the commission will not ask for any appropriation.

Mr. PARKER of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I am the author of this resolution. No Member from Georgia will ask for any appropriation, either of this Congress or the next.

Mr. PURNELL. And I may add further, no opposition was voiced to the resolution in the Committee on Rules.

Mr. COX. That is very correct.

Mr. SCHAFER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, in view of the fact this resolution apparently complies with the Democratic program in reference to expenditures for funerals and commissions, I do not think there should be objection to this resolution.

Mr. CONNERY. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I think the gentleman from New York is needlessly disturbed about this, because a similar commission participated in the celebration of the Battle of Bennington; and although the resolution provided for the expenses of the commission, the members of the commission paid their own expenses.

Mr. SNELL. The gentleman from New York has had considerable experience in seeing such commissions started, and I think he knows what he is talking about.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to substitute a similar Senate joint resolution (S. J. Res. 223), with the understanding that section 2 thereof will be stricken out.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the Senate joint resolution, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That there is hereby established a commission, to be known as the United States Georgia bicentennial commission, for the purpose of participation by the United States in the observance of the two hundredth anniversary of the founding of the Georgia colony, such commission to be composed of 21 commissioners as follows: Nine persons to be appointed by the President of the United States, 6 Senators to be appointed by the President of the Senate, and 6 Members of the House of Representatives to be appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives. The members of the commission shall serve without compensation and shall select a chairman from among their number.

SEC. 2. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of \$1,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary, to be expended by the commission established by this resolution for actual and necessary traveling expenses and subsistence while discharging its official duties outside the District of Columbia.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. Cox: On page 2, line 4, strike out all of section 2.

The amendment was agreed to.

The Senate joint resolution was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

A similar House joint resolution was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have five legislative days within which to extend their remarks on the discharge motion.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. SNELL. Mr. Speaker, may we be informed what business will be considered during the balance of the day?

The SPEAKER. This is District day. District bills will be considered as long as the House desires to consider them.

LINCOLN AND DEMOCRATIC INSTITUTIONS

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, this is the day the Nation is celebrating the birthday of a great American. I think the House of Representatives should make some recognition of the fact. I, therefore, ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BECK] be allowed to address the House for 30 minutes on the life and public service of Abraham Lincoln. [Applause.]

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. BECK. Mr. Speaker, I am indebted to the courtesy of the House for this opportunity to make a brief and inadequate reference to the one hundred and twenty-fourth anniversary of the birth of Lincoln. Time would not permit me, and in any event it would be unnecessary, to summarize his life from its cradle in a Kentucky log cabin to its Calvary in Ford's Theater.

When the French people sepulchred their greatest warrior and ruler in his tomb in the Invalides, it was their fine conception that Napoleon's fame was so universal and permanent that it was not necessary to inscribe his name upon his porphyry tomb. Similarly, it did not require a Greek temple and a Jove-like bronze effigy to perpetuate the timeless fame of Lincoln, for his true monument is in the hearts of the plain people of all nations.

My only purpose is to make some observations that may be pertinent to the present critical hour, which have been suggested by the life of Lincoln. His career should have an especial interest for this body, for he was once a Member of this House, and it may be some comfort to those of us who, in moments of disillusion, feel that our labors are so largely futile, to realize that the career of Lincoln in the House of Representatives seemed also to him wholly futile. Indeed, it may be of some comfort to many of our colleagues, whose smiling faces we shall greatly but temporarily miss after March 4, that Lincoln, too, was once a "lame duck," and then regarded his political career as definitely ended. Let us hope that, among those whom a misguided people have temporarily furloughed, some, like Lincoln, will return to Washington to accept even greater official responsibilities.

I am greatly complimented by the fact that our colleague, and my greatly valued friend, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. RAYBURN], paid me the compliment of asking the House to give its consent to this address.

I mention this not merely to acknowledge a gracious compliment paid to me by a colleague on the other side of the aisle but because this courtesy is symptomatic of a present condition in American politics, which in a time of stress and anxiety should give us encouragement as to the future of democratic institutions.

No nation can be a true democracy, however wise its form of government, unless its people are inspired by a kindly tolerance of differences of opinion. It was for this reason that Washington, in his Farewell Address, warned all succeeding generations against the excesses of partisan strife.

There is no more striking an illustration of this fact than is now observable in Germany, where one of the most finely educated people in the world find it impossible to make democratic institutions function because of the bitter rancor between men of opposite political faiths. Next March Germany will have had its fifth nation-wide election within 12

months, and each one has been accompanied by general and continuous disorder and much bloodshed.

Contrast this with the moving spectacle of our people, who, after a presidential campaign of unequaled intensity and in a period when the very sufferings of men might have produced violence, yet went to the polls last November in peace and quiet, and when the vote was counted men of both parties acquiesced in the result. Victors and vanquished united in a common feeling of good will for the historic party that is soon to assume the reins of power.

It was not always so. Prior to the Civil War there was the same intensity between the political parties as is now observable in Germany, and in three different crises the Union was on the point of disintegration. The same spirit of personal animosity was observable in the Congress, and the aisle of the Senate was not infrequently the pathway to the dueling field. It was natural that this spirit of feverish partisanship and intense antagonism continued for nearly two decades after the Civil War, during the dark and tragic days of reconstruction—a deplorable period which might never have been if Abraham Lincoln had lived.

As a native Philadelphian I take some pride in the fact that this most tragic period of our history ended when North and South met in Philadelphia to celebrate the centennial anniversary of the Declaration of Independence. Thus, meeting in May, 1876, in a lovely park, whose vernal flowers made it a new and noble field of the cloth of gold, North and South clasped hands in—as we fondly hope—a lasting amity. Since then, notwithstanding the acute differences of opinion between the two great political parties, there has been nothing but good will between them and a common and dominant desire to serve the Republic which we all love so well.

I can not but think that this is due in no small part to the influence of Abraham Lincoln. When the war was nearly ended, Lincoln, in his second inaugural, used the memorable and prophetic words:

With malice toward none, with charity for all, with firmness in the right as God gives us to see the right, let us strive on to finish the work we are in; to bind up the Nation's wounds, to care for him who shall have borne the battle, and for his widow and orphan—to do all which may achieve and cherish a just and lasting peace among ourselves and with all nations.

This was not with Lincoln a mere flourish of rhetoric, for in the few remaining days of his life his one purpose was to discountenance all talk of punishment or reprisals. He had fought to preserve the Union, and he felt that it would be an idle form unless the Southern States, which had fought so bravely, were welcomed back into the family of the Union with all their rights and privileges. He said:

We must extinguish our resentments if we expect harmony and union. There is too much desire on the part of some of our very good friends to be masters, to interfere with and dictate to those States, to treat the people not as fellow citizens; there is too little respect for their rights. I do not sympathize in those feelings.

And it is obvious that, had he been spared, the bitterness that divided the sections after Appomattox would have been short-lived.

To me Lincoln's great service in preserving the Union is not more notable than his spiritual conquest of mankind, and it was a signal vindication of the words of the apostle which, literally translated, say:

Faith, hope, and kindness; and the greatest of these is kindness.

His fine faith in the potency of this greatest force in the world was suggested in that noble passage of the first inaugural, when he predicted, in the darkest hour of the Republic:

The mystic chords of memory, stretching from every battlefield and patriot grave to every living heart and hearthstone all over this broad land, will yet swell the chorus of the Union, when again touched, as surely they will be, by the better angels of our nature.

His example of tolerance has profoundly influenced human affairs until this day. It is noteworthy that two American Presidents, Theodore Roosevelt and Woodrow Wilson, both stated that, in the most trying hours of their respective administrations, they tried to solve difficulties by asking

themselves what Lincoln would have done under like circumstances, and perhaps it was only a reflection of the same spirit which prompted a later President to forgive his enemies. I refer to an incident that happened in the administration of President McKinley, of which I heard at the time, when I had the pleasure of serving under him. There had been a bitter attack upon his Secretary of War, and one day in Cabinet that official, with a great deal of feeling, brought to the attention of the President that a certain officer of the Government had bitterly attacked him. President McKinley listened thoughtfully and then he quietly said:

"Mr. Secretary, if these reflections of which you complain were a criticism of you, they were equally a criticism of me as Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy of the United States."

The Secretary, encouraged by this statement, quickly said: "What, then, Mr. President, do you propose to do?" To which McKinley replied, "Well, I think I will forgive him," and there the incident ended.

I recognize that we are not always in our political struggles as tolerant of criticism as were Lincoln and McKinley. In the heat of political strife we often say the things which we would gladly unsay and leave unsaid the due appreciation of our opponents to which we should give fitting utterance. But, disregarding these temporary instances of intemperate expressions, the fact remains that the two great political parties, in the spirit of Lincoln, try to observe, so far as the frailties of human nature permit, that fine maxim of the medieval church:

In essentials, unity; in nonessentials, liberality; in all things, charity.

So world-wide is the spiritual conquest of Abraham Lincoln that I should not be surprised to learn that the statesmen of England, after the South African war, in which they had poured out the blood of their youth, were influenced by the spirit of Lincoln when they voluntarily granted to South Africa the home rule for which the Boers had fought. This may not be true, but it is significant that in Parliament Square, over against the great House of Parliament in London, where England's greatest men are commemorated in marble or bronze, facing the mother of parliaments and the cradle of democracy, stands a statue of Abraham Lincoln.

It is an infinite pity that the spirit of Abraham Lincoln did not prevail in the councils of Versailles in 1919. The ghastly consequences of the World War and the resentments to which it gave rise made this difficult, if not impossible; and yet the world would not to-day be in a state of such unprecedented wreckage if the spirit of Abraham Lincoln had prevailed in that misguided council of the nations.

There was something of Lincoln's spirit in Woodrow Wilson's ideal of a "peace without victory." It was bitterly criticized at the time, and I was one of the critics, but the present condition of the world now gives proof that the principle of *vae victis*, or "woe to the conquered," can never produce a lasting peace. At the time it was uttered it was an impracticable ideal, for, as the combatant nations had poured out the blood of their youth as water, a compromise peace was then as impossible as would have been a similar peace in the midst of the Civil War.

A nobler interpretation of President Wilson's famous saying may be that after the victory had been won a fine and magnanimous spirit should be shown by the victors to the vanquished. Unhappily, this, too, was impracticable in 1919, for the civilized world had been shell shocked and was incapable of rational measures. If the same spirit which Lincoln showed in 1865 to the vanquished States had been shown by the allied nations to their prostrate foes the world would not to-day be in a state of almost cureless ruin.

Lincoln reached the height of his fame at Gettysburg. His now classic address was very brief. Numbering only 367 words, it must have been spoken in about two minutes.

Webster once said that the three essential requisites of a great speech are the man, the subject, and the occasion, and the Gettysburg speech, which so cultivated an English statesman as Lord Curzon declared the noblest speech in the

English language, had all three requisites. Spoken on another occasion or by another man, it might not have gained the universal acclaim which has been its exalted portion. The subject was the preservation of a democratic union; the occasion the dedication of a sacred area in which were newly buried the soldiers who had died for the Union; and the speaker was one who had borne upon his shoulders the weight of a great Nation, and who, standing within the shadow of his approaching martyrdom, was as that other Man of Sorrows, who was "acquainted with grief."

The speaker chose the occasion to reaffirm his faith in government "of the people, by the people, and for the people." There was a significance in this reaffirmation, which is sometimes forgotten. Before Gettysburg the European nations had become increasingly unfriendly to the Union, and the courts of Europe were even then exchanging notes for a joint intervention to destroy the American Republic, because it was to some of them a menace to the autocratic pretensions of their dynasties. To this challenge of democracy Lincoln proudly said that popular government "shall not perish from the earth." It was America's answer to a Europe still dominated by the reactionary councils of the Congress of Vienna.

The next half century was marked by the onward march of triumphant democracy. Nation after nation yielded to its imperious demands, and when President Wilson led the American Republic into the greatest war in history it was under the inspired battle cry that the world must be "made safe for democracy." This was a fitting echo of Lincoln's speech at Gettysburg.

It is, however, of profound significance that, so far as we can now measure with our limited vision, the present effect of the World War has arrested the onward march of democracy and resulted in a portentous retrogression to autocracy. It is true that when this greatest war of history had ended and the roar of the last gun on the long battle line had died away in distant echoes, it seemed for a little time that "government of the people, for the people, and by the people" had been vindicated, and that the world had been made safe for democracy.

Never in a thousand years had there been such a dissolution of ancient forms. Crowns had fallen "thick as autumnal leaves that strew the brooks of Vallombrosa." Ancient dynasties had perished and kingdoms and empires of a thousand years vanished into thin air.

And then a mighty change came over the world's dream of democracy. A reaction, swift and terrible, against parliamentary government, through which democracy alone can function, swept over the world like the shadow of a huge eclipse. Russia destroyed the rule of the czars but rejected democracy in accepting a class tyranny infinitely worse than the rule of the worst of the Czars. China became a republic in form, but is now in the welter of anarchy. Italy accepted the rule of a dictator, who, however beneficent his autocratic rule may be, loses no occasion to flout democracy. Spain accepted for a time the rule of a military dictator; democracy yielded to a dictator in Greece—the very land that gave us not only the idea but the very word "democracy."

Seventy years after Lincoln's vindication of democracy, popular government in the greater part of the world seems to be in more serious danger than at any time since Jefferson, like Chanticleer, proclaimed the "reddening morn" of democracy.

Human progress moves in a constant series of ascending and descending curves; or, to change the metaphor, its forces are at times centripetal and at times centrifugal. Man has, throughout all history, passed through a ceaseless cycle of integration and disintegration. Every age that has been marked by the concentration of power in the hands of a few has been followed by a redistribution of that power among the many; and, in turn, every democratic movement, when it has spent its force, has been succeeded by a period of integration.

No present fact is more significant than the reaction in many nations against democracy and in favor of one-man power. It matters not whether the one man be called a

czar, emperor, king, or dictator—the essential fact is his power. To-day half of the oldest nations of Europe are in the grasp of dictators. The revolt is not against democracy as a social ideal, but against the inefficiency of parliamentary institutions.

At no time within the memory of living man has Lincoln's ideal of a government "of and by and for the people" been more openly denied and flouted. If the parliamentary system, which we call democracy, is ineffective, resort will inevitably be had to the more ancient forms of power. The World War has revealed, as in a vast illumination, the fact that democracy is not workable unless there be a people politically capable of self-government. The founders of our Nation recognized this. Washington, Franklin, and Hamilton all said that the success of popular government depended less upon its form than upon the moral and intellectual capacity of the people. If they fail to take an intelligent interest in their government and if they are unprepared to show the spirit of self-restraint, which I have elsewhere called "constitutional morality," there can be no successful democracy.

It is easy for a people to be content with popular government when prosperity is general. Let there be in this Nation a prolonged period of adversity, and our institutions will be brought to a real test; and the prophecy of Lord Macaulay, voiced nearly 70 years ago, may have a terrible vindication.

Let us not lay the "flattering unction to our souls" that we have finally and completely solved the great problem of popular government. It is still, to use the words of Lincoln, "an unfinished task," and to it the living, from generation to generation, must still dedicate themselves. Our institutions are not static, but always in a state of flux.

A democracy can only function through party government.

I like the spirit of our mother country, which calls the majority in Parliament "His Majesty's Government" and the minority "His Majesty's Opposition." It expresses a truth that both parties serve the sovereign people, even when they differ as to the policies of the nation. To us the American people is "His Majesty." The large majority which the Democratic Party will have in the next Congress will be "His Majesty's Government," and the small minority, to which I belong, will be "His Majesty's Opposition," both playing different parts in a common symphony, but we will both serve the public by debating conflicting policies, for a fair and frank expression of opposite views often results in one of those compromises which are often a necessary ingredient of true statesmanship.

During my short service in Congress I have often regretted that, under the stress of our complex problems, this House becomes less and less a great forum for discussion. Debate serves a great purpose, and when the next Congress convenes I shall venture to suggest to the majority leaders a modification of our rules under which there shall be set aside each month two days—say the first and third Tuesday of each month—to be called the "State of the Union" day, and on those days two or more speeches shall be made by men of both parties, to be selected by the floor leaders, respectively, upon some issue of general importance.

This would have the advantage of concentrating debate upon some vital question and would attract far more attention than the unrelated speeches which are made in general debate when the House sits as a Committee of the Whole. On these days the House would again become a great national forum, and if this idea were adopted I believe the American people would follow the debates with more interest than I fear they now do.

The sound instinct of the American people still accepts democracy. In determining its merits, as in every other problem, regard must be had for the ponderables and the imponderables. Judged by the former only, our faith in democracy would be weakened, for its inefficiency in great crises can not be doubted. But the American people believe in it because of the great imponderable, that it is the only form of government consistent with the self-respect of a proud people, that it gives hope to the masses and raises

them in intellectual and moral stature. The average man, even when plunged in the "slough of despond" of an inefficient and at times corrupt government, sees beyond the "delectable mountains" and he struggles out of the morass and presses onward. Such was the spirit of Washington and Lincoln, and it is this invincible faith, triumphing over fear, that has made them the two great leaders of the American people. As long as democracy can produce two such leaders it vindicates itself.

It must also be remembered that the comparative success of popular government in America is due in large part to the Constitution of the United States, which is not wholly democratic nor wholly undemocratic. That great charter of government rejected the idea that the majority ruled by divine right.

Abraham Lincoln devoutly believed that the Constitution was the whole "law and the prophets" of popular government. His faith in that Constitution has been amply vindicated, for in all the violent storms of the last 25 years, in which all forms of government have been shaken to their very foundations, the most stable has been that of the Constitution of the United States. To-day it is the oldest comprehensive written form of government in the world. "We, the people," ordained it, and "We, the people," must preserve it.

Our Republic, however, can not be perpetuated by words written on parchment, even though they form so wise a document as the Constitution. The essential spirit of a Republic, without which it can not lastingly survive, is the faith of the American people in its wisdom and justice.

It is therefore unfortunate that the American people indulge in so much indiscriminate abuse of their form of government, and especially of its legislative branch. I imagine that each of my colleagues is the recipient, as I have been, of almost daily letters in which there are the most bitter and unreasoning criticisms of Congress. There is no adequate recognition of the earnest effort of Members of Congress to solve the difficult and often insoluble problems with which we are confronted from day to day.

Our critics fail to realize that the Nation has long since grown too great for its political machinery. There is reason to fear that our Government is a giant with feet of clay. We are constantly reminded how inferior we are as a body to the Congresses of a century ago; but our critics fail to recognize that an indulgent posterity remembers their achievements but casts the veil of oblivion over their deficiencies. There never was a time when the Congress was not a disappointment to the American people. The difficulty is that the impossible is expected of us.

Let me recall a picture of other times, which was drawn by a master:

If I were to be called upon to draw a picture of the times and of men from what I have seen and heard and in part know, I should in one way say that idleness, dissipation, and extravagance seem to have laid fast hold of most of them. That speculation—speculation—and an insatiable thirst for riches seem to have got the better of every other consideration and almost of every order of men. That party disputes and personal quarrels are the great business of the day, whilst the momentous concerns of an empire—a great and accumulated debt, ruined finances, depreciated money, and want of credit (which in their consequences is the want of everything)—are but secondary considerations and postponed from day to day, from week to week, as if our affairs wear the most promising aspect.

This is certainly a dark picture of another age of the Republic, and it is interesting to add that I have quoted one of the most courageous of men, George Washington. If he had his moments of despair, the present generation may be excused for some pessimism. The Republic survived the dark days to which Washington referred and the critical days through which Lincoln lived.

In a time when even thoughtful men are despairing as to whether democratic institutions can survive, we may well recall the memory of Lincoln as a great democrat. I use the word in its broadest and most catholic sense. He was a man of the people, and he loved and believed in the people. Nothing could shake his faith, and he poured out his heart's blood to preserve the noblest democracy in recorded history.

The two great democrats of American history are Franklin and Lincoln. Each was a self-made man and from the depths of poverty reached the heights of an undying reputation. With little education each became a supremely wise man, and yet each had something that is finer than ordinary wisdom and that is common sense. Each had a sense of humor, which not only confirmed his faith, but made him tolerant of human error. Each, despite his lack of early education, became a master of style, and each drew his inspiration from the Bible and Shakespeare. Franklin laid the foundations of the American Commonwealth, Washington erected the superstructure of the Constitution, and Lincoln preserved it.

It is natural that in this critical age men should despair of democracy as of all human institutions, but as long as a democracy can produce such men as Franklin, Washington, and Lincoln, we need not despair of its future. Our form of government may change from generation to generation in its ceaseless adaptation to new social changes, but as long as the spirit of Franklin, Washington, and Lincoln remains, we can believe in the rule of the people.

A great moralist once said:

The life of Lincoln should never be passed by in silence by young or old. He touched the log cabin and it became the palace in which greatness was nurtured. He touched the forest and it became to him a church in which the purest and noblest worship of God was observed. His occupation has become associated in our minds with the integrity of the life he lived. In Lincoln there was always some quality that fastened him to the people and taught them to keep time to the music of his heart.

My colleagues of the House, as we stand upon the threshold of a new administration, in one of the most critical periods of our history, let us be inspired by the spirit of Franklin, Washington, and Lincoln, who shine forever in the firmament of fame, as the luminous and steadfast Pleiades. [Applause.]

WHAT WOULD LINCOLN DO?

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for five minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. CULLEN). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I have listened with a great deal of interest to the eloquent address of the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BECK] on the life and character of Abraham Lincoln.

I wish to address you for a moment on the subject, "What Would Lincoln Do if He Were President To-day?"

As you know, I am a southern Democrat. I have often been referred to as an unreconstructed rebel. My people fought in the Confederate Army and suffered as a result of the devastating effects of the Civil War. Necessarily, my viewpoint differs from that of a great many Members of this House. But I have never been so partisan or so sectional that I could not recognize the sterling qualities of the man who occupied the Presidency of the United States during the trying years of that unfortunate conflict.

Whatever else may be said of Abraham Lincoln, by friends or foes, we must admit his sympathetic consideration for the masses of people from whom he sprang, and his courage to translate his sympathies into action whenever the occasion required.

What would Lincoln do if he were President of the United States now, under the terrible conditions through which we are passing, and have been passing for the last three years? In my opinion, he would do just what he did do under similar circumstances during the Civil War. When a financial crisis came on and it was necessary to do so, he swept aside, with a wave of his hand, those mercenary influences that were attempting to control the finances of the Republic for their own special benefit and forced an expansion of the currency to supply the necessary funds with which to carry on the conflict as well as to guarantee reasonable commodity prices and maintain the purchasing power of the people.

If Abraham Lincoln were President of the United States to-day, judging by his action then, we are forced to the

conclusion that he would again scourge the money changers from the temple, and wrest this country from the control of those greedy interests and individuals who are responsible for the policies that are now squeezing the lifeblood from the American people. He would turn a deaf ear to the insidious appeals of the minions of concentrated wealth. He would refuse to be guided in his policies by the advice of selfish interests, or selfish individuals, who would perpetuate this panic and wreck the Republic in order to rise upon its ruin.

On the other hand, he would hear the pleas of the bankrupt business men of the Nation. He would hear the appeals of the distressed farmers, who are now seeing their homes swept away for debts or sold to pay their taxes. He would see the tears and hear the cries of the suffering women and children who have been made homeless and penniless as a result of the concentration of wealth and the contraction of the currency, coupled with the hoarding of money by the very ones who have profited most as a result of the ruination their policies have wrought.

Mr. Speaker, in my humble opinion, if Abraham Lincoln were President to-day, or if he had been President for the last three years, he would long since have recommended and secured the passage of the necessary legislation to provide for a controlled expansion of the currency, such as we are appealing for to-day, to bring back farm commodity prices, and restore the purchasing power of the American people, melt away our bread lines, start our factory wheels to turning, furnish work for our unemployed, bring new hope and new life to the American people, and cause us to move forward into a new era of prosperity. [Applause.]

AMENDMENT OF CHARTERS OF CERTAIN ORPHAN ASYLUMS IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mrs. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on the District of Columbia, I call up the bill (S. 4673) to amend an act entitled "An act to incorporate the trustees of the Female Orphan Asylum in Georgetown, and the Washington City Orphan Asylum in the District of Columbia," approved May 24, 1828, as amended by act of June 23, 1874.

I may say, in explanation of this measure, it simply removes the limitation placed by the act of incorporation on the amount of annual income allowed the orphanages mentioned herein.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 3 of the act entitled "An act to incorporate the trustees of the Female Orphan Asylum in Georgetown, and the Washington City Orphan Asylum in the District of Columbia," approved May 24, 1828, as amended by act of June 23, 1874 (relating to the amount of annual income from property belonging to the trustees of either of said corporations), is amended by striking out "to a sum not exceeding \$25,000 per annum" and inserting in lieu thereof "and such clear annual income of each of said corporations shall be applied to and for the purposes for which it was incorporated."

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman from New Jersey yield for a question?

Mrs. NORTON. Gladly.

Mr. STAFFORD. Can the gentlewoman from New Jersey inform the House the reason why any limit whatsoever was heretofore placed on these individual institutions as to the amount of income they could receive and dispense?

Mrs. NORTON. The gentleman from Maryland [Mr. PALMISANO] would like to answer that question.

Mr. PALMISANO. Of course, this is an old charter granted by the Congress. It seems that at that time it was customary to place a limit on all charitable institutions; and, as the gentleman from Wisconsin will recall, we had a similar bill in the last session in reference to the Acacia Insurance Co., which is under the Masonic order. They were also limited in a certain way.

Mr. STAFFORD. That bill was originally vetoed by President Harding because this organization was seeking to gain business under the name of a Masonic insurance company and thereby more or less inveigle the people generally into the belief that they had some authority in connection with a highly esteemed secret society. Thereupon, after the

bill was returned with a veto, this private organization which sought to have the advantage of doing business with others than those connected with the Masonic fraternity changed the name and adopted the Masonic name, I believe, Acacia.

At that time there had been other bills of similar import introduced, and I was wondering why that company, like other companies, could not avail itself of the general privileges under the incorporation laws of the District of Columbia.

In the last Congress we had another instance, where the order of Knights of Pythias sought to gain certain advantages that were not extended generally to corporations incorporated in the District so as to avoid having certain inspections made by the superintendent of insurance.

I am not in sympathy with these laws that seek to grant special favors, when there are general laws in the District of Columbia which would permit them to avail themselves of these privileges.

Mr. PALMISANO. I may say to the gentleman from Wisconsin that we have taken the position in the District of Columbia Committee that we will refuse national charters to private corporations.

Mr. STAFFORD. I wish to commend the action of the committee in taking that stand.

Mr. PALMISANO. In a case of that kind, here are two orphan asylums created by act of Congress. They have received certain benefits. Under the general law they may lose those benefits if they amend the charter, and this is the only way they can obtain those benefits that they have derived.

Mr. STAFFORD. I think the gentlemen sets forth a good reason why the bill should be passed.

Mrs. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the bill to final passage.

The previous question was ordered.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

PAYMENT OF TAXES ON FAMILY DWELLING HOUSES IN QUARTERLY INSTALLMENTS

Mrs. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I call up the bill (H. R. 14392) to authorize the payment of taxes and assessments on family dwelling houses in the District of Columbia in quarterly installments, and for other purposes. I move that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for its consideration, and I ask unanimous consent that debate be limited to 20 minutes, one-half to be controlled by myself and one-half by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN].

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. CULLEN). Is there objection to the request of the lady from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

The motion of Mrs. NORTON was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, with Mr. DOXEY in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

Mrs. NORTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. STAFFORD].

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, it is farthest from my thought to consume 10 minutes, but I wish some member of the committee would furnish information as to whether any other municipality in the country has adopted the proposal sought here for the payment of taxes quarterly? That is to me a departure from any existing system of tax collection. I am heartily in sympathy with the other provisions of the bill, the deferment of the collection of taxes for this year, but I query whether any city in the country has adopted the method of quarterly payments?

Mr. PALMISANO. Let me say to the gentleman that Baltimore City has adopted the quarterly installment plan for three years. That was done in order to help small property owners to pay in small sums so that when the end of the year comes they would not be met with the necessity of getting the whole amount.

Mr. STAFFORD. Does the gentleman know of any other city where that method has been adopted?

Mr. CHIPERFIELD. It has been adopted in the city of Chicago.

Mr. STAFFORD. That is on account of conditions in that corrupt suburb of Milwaukee. In Milwaukee we have not found it necessary or proper for the payment of taxes quarterly. There has been a deferment of taxes for six months or even a year because of the financial embarrassment of property owners. It is a bill providing for all time, whether the conditions are exigent or not.

Mr. CHIPERFIELD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STAFFORD. Yes.

Mr. CHIPERFIELD. I am sorry to destroy the theory of the gentleman concerning the depraved condition of Chicago, and do not care to dissent from him, but that system of the payment of taxes arises under the laws of the State of Illinois at the present time.

Mr. STAFFORD. Anyone who is but slightly acquainted with the conditions of Chicago knows that they have been outrageous, and that the trouble which besets Chicago is due to its corrupt local government.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STAFFORD. Yes.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. In answer to the gentleman's query, I might state that the State of Mississippi and the municipalities of that State now for the second year are trying and, I think, quite satisfactorily, the quarterly payment of taxes. The plan follows the payment of income taxes, taxes being collected for the next fiscal year, and I see no reason why the taxpayer should not retain those funds and pay them quarterly rather than that the banks should hold them.

Mr. STAFFORD. In Mississippi, as I understand the gentleman, it is being tried out.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. No; it is being tried for the second year.

Mr. STAFFORD. But it is not permanent law; it is a temporary arrangement.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. No. I said that we are now trying it for the second year, and it is quite satisfactory.

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STAFFORD. Yes.

Mr. GOSS. My understanding is that the District of Columbia can not borrow money. Most municipalities borrow money in anticipation of the collection of taxes; and in view of the fact that the District of Columbia can not borrow money in anticipation of taxes levied and collected, it seems to me that a quarterly payment might be considered from a different viewpoint than in other municipalities.

Mr. STAFFORD. The gentleman will notice in the report that there is no reference whatever as to whether this has been submitted to the Commissioners of the District for their approval.

Mrs. NORTON. Mr. Chairman, the District Commissioners are in entire accord with the bill. A year ago this bill was suggested, and they were not then in accord with it, but since that time they have come to realize that it is going to mean a very much easier method of payment for the people of the District on account of our present conditions, and they have heartily indorsed the bill.

Mr. STAFFORD. We can all agree that by reason of the exceptional conditions prevailing they may not oppose it as a temporary measure, but do they approve it as a permanent law?

Mrs. NORTON. I may say to the gentleman that it is my understanding they are willing to approve it as a permanent law. If conditions change, I presume they would have the right to come to Congress and ask for a change in the law if they so desire.

Mr. STAFFORD. As I understand the other provisions relating to the deferring of payments, those who are asking the privilege will be obliged to pay 6 per cent interest on the remaining amount.

Mrs. NORTON. Yes. I understand that is the prevailing rate of interest.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the remainder of the time.

Mrs. NORTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN].

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, I have no objection to the part of the bill permitting taxes to be paid quarterly. The part of the bill that I object to is requiring the assessor of the District of Columbia to furnish the owners of property in the District with an itemized statement of the taxes that will be due. I have never heard of any municipality, county, or State government being required to furnish itemized statements of taxes in advance of the day of collection. The people generally know when they have to pay taxes. They keep up with it themselves. It is all right to furnish an itemized statement when the owner requests it, and under the present law the assessor of the District is so required to furnish such an itemized statement, but I can not understand why as a condition precedent to the collection of taxes the assessor must first furnish an itemized statement of the amount of taxes due, to the owner of the property.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. Yes.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. In the city of New York by leaving your name and address they notify you in advance of the amount due.

Mr. PATMAN. Under the present law they will do so here upon request.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Just by leaving your name and address every year.

Mr. PATMAN. Why make it a requirement that you must first notify the property owners before you can collect the taxes? The District will be in all kinds of lawsuits as a result of it.

Mr. PARKS. Would it not serve the same purpose if the bill said, "on request of the taxpayer"?

Mr. PATMAN. That is the present law.

Mrs. NORTON. Mr. Chairman, I should be glad to accept an amendment to that effect.

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. Yes.

Mr. GOSS. It is not mandatory as I read the bill. Is the gentleman talking about section 5?

Mr. PATMAN. No. The bill says "shall send."

Mr. GOSS. But it reads:

The assessor shall send an itemized statement of such taxes to the owner upon request made by the owner and filed with the assessor not later than—

Mr. PATMAN. Those are the subsequent statements. I am referring to the first part of section 1 where it reads:

The assessor of the District of Columbia shall send to the owner of each family dwelling house occupied by such owner an itemized statement of the taxes payable with respect to such dwelling house not less than 30 days prior to the time when the first installment of real-estate taxes for such fiscal year becomes due and payable.

In other words, in order to collect the taxes, in any delinquent tax proceeding, it would be necessary under the law to first show by the assessor that prior to 30 days he had sent the owner of the property an itemized statement of the taxes due. Unless he could show that, he could not foreclose on the property.

Mr. HOLMES. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield.

Mr. HOLMES. The assessor at the present time sends an itemized statement to every man who owes the District personal taxes. This is no more than what the District could expect or require of the assessor, to give them an itemized statement of their property.

Mr. PATMAN. If the gentleman will pardon me, my time is very limited. I think this law will cause the District of Columbia additional expense.

Mr. HOLMES. Not a great deal.

Mr. PATMAN. In the first place, there must be additional people employed to send out these notices. Under the law,

any person who wants an itemized statement can get it. Why send it to people who do not want it? The chairman of the committee has already agreed to accept the amendment.

Mr. HOLMES. I have no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That each fiscal year, commencing with the fiscal year ending June 30, 1934, the assessor of the District of Columbia shall send to the owner of each family dwelling house occupied by such owner an itemized statement of the taxes payable with respect to such dwelling house not less than 30 days prior to the time when the first installment of real-estate taxes for such fiscal year becomes due and payable. Such statement shall include all real-estate taxes which are due and payable in such fiscal year and all installments of special assessments which have been levied, charged, or assessed prior to, and are due and payable in, such fiscal year, with respect to the family dwelling house occupied by the owner. Such taxes and assessments shall be payable, at the election of the taxpayer, in four equal installments, in the months of September, December, March, and June, and no interest shall be payable with respect to any such installment unless it is unpaid after the time it is due. Any real-estate tax or special assessment or any installment thereof with respect to any family dwelling house occupied by the owner thereof not included in such statement shall not be due or payable during the fiscal year for which the statement is sent; and any such tax or assessment or any installment thereof otherwise chargeable, assessable, or payable during such fiscal year shall be included in the statement for the next succeeding fiscal year.

Mr. PATMAN. I offer an amendment, Mr. Chairman.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. PATMAN: Page 1, line 6, after the word "owner," insert the words "upon written application therefor," and on page 1, line 7, after the word "house," insert a period and strike out the words "not less than 30 days prior to the time when the first installment of real-estate taxes for such fiscal year becomes due and payable."

Mr. STAFFORD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield.

Mr. STAFFORD. I have some difficulty in bringing myself to subscribe to the second substantive proposal of the gentleman's amendment, striking out. It is my opinion that the assessor of the District should be obligated not less than 30 days prior to the time to furnish the respective owners of dwelling houses a statement of the taxes owing.

Mr. PATMAN. I thoroughly agree with the gentleman that he should furnish a statement but should not be restricted to within 30 days. If they want a statement within 30 days, he should be required to furnish it. He should be required to furnish it immediately at any time, without reference to any 30 days' time.

Mr. STAFFORD. Oh, the gentleman knows that the assessor is not in a position to furnish a statement of taxes at all times.

Mr. PATMAN. I think the gentleman will find we have a very efficient office in the District of Columbia, and that they can furnish such statements immediately. It has been the custom to furnish them immediately.

Mr. STAFFORD. It is absolutely impossible for the assessor of taxes to furnish a statement before the taxes are levied. It takes time. The gentleman is destroying the very purpose of the bill by striking out those words.

Mr. PATMAN. I have no objection to a provision like this going into the bill if it is understood that in the collection of delinquent taxes the District will not have to show first that this statement was furnished 30 days prior to the time the taxes were due. I do not want that as a condition precedent to the collection.

Mr. STAFFORD. The very wording of the clause which the gentleman seeks to strike out, "not less than 30 days," makes the act inoperative. We should give leeway to the administrative officers to furnish a statement of the taxes.

Mr. PATMAN. I realize the force of the gentleman's argument, and I will not insist on that if no other member of the committee desires to insist on it.

Mr. STAFFORD. Then I ask for a division of the amendment, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw the latter part of the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Chairman, may we have the amendment again reported as modified?

The Clerk read as follows:

Modified amendment offered by Mr. PATMAN: Page 1, line 6, after the word "owner," insert the words "upon written application therefor."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas.

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 3. After the date of enactment of this act no family dwelling house occupied by the owner thereof shall be sold for delinquent personal or real estate taxes or special assessments unless notice has been personally served upon such owner or sent by registered mail, addressed to him at such dwelling house, not less than 30 days prior to the date of such sale.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

I wish to inquire of some member of the Committee on the District of Columbia what the prevailing practice is as to requiring notice to be furnished to the owner when taxes are delinquent. This section prescribes that no sale shall take place unless notice has been personally served or sent by registered mail, addressed to him at such dwelling house. Is that the prevailing practice?

Mr. PALMISANO. I think so. It is a sort of summons. In Baltimore there is a law to that effect.

Mr. STAFFORD. I do not want Baltimore to be too potent in determining the policy for the District of Columbia. Conditions are entirely different. Baltimore can raise funds to meet current expenses by making loans from the banks. The Commissioners of the District of Columbia can not.

Mr. PALMISANO. I think it is a good law. It is to protect the individual from the forced sale of his property. Sometimes a person may feel he has paid his taxes and then if he does not receive notice, the property is put up and sold without him receiving any notice at all.

The pro forma amendment was withdrawn.

The Clerk concluded the reading of the bill.

Mrs. NORTON. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House with an amendment with the recommendation that the bill as amended do pass.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the committee rose; and Mr. CULLEN, the Speaker pro tempore, having resumed the chair, Mr. DOXEY, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee, having had under consideration the bill H. R. 14392, directed him to report the same back to the House with an amendment, with the recommendation that the amendment be agreed to and that the bill as amended do pass.

Mrs. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the bill and the amendment thereto to find passage.

The previous question was ordered.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill as amended was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

On motion of Mrs. NORTON, a motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed was laid on the table.

SALE OF GOVERNMENT PROPERTY

Mrs. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I call up the bill (H. R. 11504) authorizing the sale of certain Government property in the District of Columbia, and ask unanimous consent that this bill be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Commissioners of the District of Columbia, in their discretion, be, and they are hereby, authorized

to sell for cash, under such rules and regulations as they may prescribe, lot 801, square 5990, comprising 97 feet, more or less, in rear of 3204 Brothers Place SE., Washington, D. C.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

On motion of Mrs. NORTON, a motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed was laid on the table.

AMENDMENT OF THE REVISED STATUTES

Mrs. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I call up the bill (H. R. 13378) to amend sections 416 and 417 of the Revised Statutes relating to the District of Columbia, and ask unanimous consent that this bill be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I wish to ask the gentlewoman from New Jersey the effect of striking out \$100 and inserting in lieu thereof \$500 in line 6, on page 1, of the bill.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, if the gentlewoman will permit, the bill purposes to increase the amount that may be administered without going through the intricate machinery of law.

Mr. BLANTON. That explains the whole situation. I have no objection to the bill.

Mrs. NORTON. I may say to the gentleman from Texas that an explanation of this item appears further down in the report.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 416 of the Revised Statutes relating to the District of Columbia be amended by striking out the word "fifty" where it occurs in said section and inserting in lieu thereof the words "one hundred."

SEC. 2. That section 417 of the Revised Statutes relating to the District of Columbia be amended so as to read as follows:

"SEC. 417. All property, except perishable property and animals, that shall remain in the custody of the property clerk for the period of six months, with the exception of motor vehicles, which shall be held for a period of three months, without any lawful claimant thereto after having been three times advertised in some daily newspaper of general circulation published in the District of Columbia shall be sold at public auction, and the proceeds of such sale shall be paid into the policemen's fund; and all money that shall remain in his hands for said period of six months shall be so advertised, and if no lawful claimant appear shall be likewise paid into the policemen's fund."

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 6, strike out the words "one hundred" and insert in lieu thereof the words "five hundred."

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

On motion of Mrs. NORTON, a motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed was laid on the table.

AMATEUR BOXING

Mrs. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I call up the bill (H. R. 6292) to prevent professional prize fighting and to authorize amateur boxing in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes, and ask unanimous consent that it may be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That whoever shall in the District of Columbia voluntarily engage in a pugilistic encounter shall be imprisoned for not more than five years. By the term "pugilistic encounter," as herein used, is meant any voluntary fight by blows by means of fists or otherwise, whether with or without gloves, between two or more men for money or anything of value except a suitably inscribed wreath, diploma, banner, badge, medal, or timepiece not exceeding the value of \$35, or upon the result of which any money or anything of value is bet or wagered, or to see which an admission fee of more than \$2 is directly or indirectly charged.

SEC. 2. (a) There is hereby created for the District of Columbia a boxing commission, to be composed of three members appointed

by the Commissioners of the District of Columbia, one of whom shall be a member of the police department of the District of Columbia. No person shall be eligible for appointment to membership on the commission unless such person at the time of appointment is and for at least three years prior thereto has been a resident of the District of Columbia. The terms of office of the members of the commission first taking office after the approval of this act shall expire at the end of two years from the date of the approval of this act. A successor to a member of the commission shall be appointed in the same manner as the original members and shall have a term of office expiring two years from the date of the expiration of the term for which his predecessor was appointed, except that any person appointed to fill a vacancy occurring prior to the expiration of the term for which his predecessor was appointed shall be appointed for the remainder of such term. The members of the commission shall receive no compensation for their services. The Commissioners of the District of Columbia shall furnish to the boxing commission such office space and clerical and other assistance as may be necessary.

(b) Subject to the approval of the Commissioners of the District of Columbia, the commission shall have power (1) to cooperate with organizations engaged in the promotion and control of amateur boxing; (2) to supervise and regulate amateur boxing within the District of Columbia; and (3) to make such orders, rules, and regulations as the commission deems necessary for carrying out the powers herein conferred upon it.

(c) No person shall hold a boxing exhibition in the District of Columbia without a permit from the commission, but the commission shall not issue any such permit except to a club, university, college, school, or other organization or institution which the commission finds is interested in the promotion of amateur athletics. Each such permit shall be limited to a period of one day, except that in case of any interscholastic boxing meet or similar contest a permit may be issued for the duration of such meet or contest. No such permit shall be issued to any person unless such person agrees to accord to the commission the right to examine the books of accounts and other records of such person relating to the boxing exhibition for which such permit is issued, and such permit shall so state on its face. A permit may be revoked at any time in the discretion of the commission.

(d) No individual shall engage in any boxing exhibition in the District of Columbia without a license from the commission. Such license shall entitle the licensee to engage in amateur boxing exhibitions in the District of Columbia for the period specified therein, but the commission shall not issue any such license to any individual if the commission finds that such individual has at any time or place engaged in any professional prize fight or in any boxing exhibition for which he received money as compensation or reward, and the commission shall revoke any such license if at any time, after notice and hearing, it makes such finding in respect of the licensee, and may revoke any such license at any time for violation by the licensee of any order, rule, or regulation of the commission, or for other cause.

(e) Any permit or license issued by the board shall not be valid for the purpose of holding or engaging in, respectively, any boxing exhibition which does not conform to the following conditions: (1) Such exhibition may consist of one or more bouts, but no such bout shall continue for more than four rounds; (2) no round shall exceed three minutes; (3) there shall be an interval of one minute between each round and the succeeding round; and (4) each contestant shall use gloves of not less than 8 ounces each in weight.

(f) The commission may charge for permits and for licenses such fees as will, in its opinion, defray the cost of issuance thereof and other necessary expenses of the commission.

(g) Any person who (1) holds any boxing exhibition in the District of Columbia without a permit valid and effective at the time, or (2) engages in any boxing exhibition in the District of Columbia without a license valid and effective at the time, or (3) violates any lawful order, rule, or regulation of the commission shall, upon conviction thereof, be fined not more than \$1,000 or imprisoned not more than one year, or both.

(h) The term "person," as used in this act, includes individuals, partnerships, corporations, and associations.

Mrs. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the bill to final passage.

The previous question was ordered.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

On motion of Mrs. NORTON, a motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed was laid on the table.

AMENDMENT OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA CODE

Mrs. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I call up the bill (H. R. 14204) to amend section 653 of the Code of Law for the District of Columbia and ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from New Jersey?

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, may the bill be read for information?

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the provision of section 653 of the act of Congress, approved March 3, 1901, entitled "An act to establish a Code of Law for the District of Columbia," as amended by the act of Congress approved August 15, 1911, which said provision reads: "Every such company or association shall pay to the collector of taxes for the District of Columbia a sum of money, as tax, equal to 1 per cent of all moneys received from members of policy or certificate holders within the District of Columbia, said tax to be paid on or before the 1st day of March of each year on the amount of such income for the year ending December 31 next preceding," is hereby amended to read:

"Every such company or association shall pay to the collector of taxes for the District of Columbia a sum of money as taxes equal to 1½ per cent of its net premium receipts from business done in the District of Columbia, said taxes to be paid before the 1st day of March of each year on the amount of such income for the year ending December 31 next preceding, in lieu of all other taxes, except taxes upon real estate and any license fees provided for in sections 654 and 655; and upon the failure of any company to pay said taxes before March 1, as aforesaid, the license of said company shall be revoked and a penalty of 8 per cent per month shall be charged against said company which, together with said taxes, shall be collected before said company shall be allowed to resume business."

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I want to ask the gentlewoman from New Jersey a question. Under the present law the insurance companies pay 1 per cent tax on all receipts, and under the proposed amendment they will pay 1½ per cent on net premiums. Does this bill come from the Commissioners of the District of Columbia?

Mrs. NORTON. Yes.

Mr. BLANTON. It was prepared by them and sent to the gentlewoman's committee with the request that she introduce it?

Mrs. NORTON. Yes; I introduced the bill by request.

Mr. BLANTON. And the commissioners are proposing it?

Mrs. NORTON. Yes; they are sponsoring the bill.

Mr. BLANTON. Has the gentlewoman from New Jersey investigated to find out whether or not this is relieving corporations of a tax that they ought to pay?

Mrs. NORTON. I may say to the gentleman from Texas that this measure was referred to the subcommittee of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HARLAN], and he is prepared to answer that question.

Mr. HARLAN. The difference, I will say to the gentleman from Texas, is that both sections 650 and 653 apply to premium incomes and are on the same subject. There is an apparent conflict to this extent—

Mr. BLANTON. Will the gentleman answer the question I asked as to whether or not it relieves them of present liability and whether or not their tax will be greater or less than it is now?

Mr. HARLAN. It increases the tax to the extent of \$100,000 a year.

Mr. BLANTON. Is the gentleman sure of that?

Mr. HARLAN. I am absolutely sure of it.

Mr. BLANTON. Does the gentleman know where the influence came from that caused the commissioners to be interested in this matter?

Mr. HARLAN. I can answer that if the gentleman will let me continue.

Mr. BLANTON. There are only certain things I want to know, and if the gentleman will answer my questions so that I may get definite answers, I may not take up any time at all on the bill. I want to know what outside influence there was, if any, that caused the commissioners to get interested in this change.

Mr. HARLAN. They want to collect the additional \$100,000 a year which, apparently, the insurance companies are willing to pay to avoid future litigation growing out of the conflict in these two sections.

Mr. BLANTON. Then it is the commissioners' idea and not the idea of the insurance companies?

Mr. HARLAN. Yes.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, under reservation of objection, I regard this bill as rather important and I would like to have some explanation of the measure, particularly, as to this phase. Under the substitute amendment it is pro-

posed to relieve these insurance companies of all other taxes except taxes upon real estate.

Mr. HARLAN. And license fees.

Mr. STAFFORD. For this privilege of increasing the tax one-half of 1 per cent.

Mr. HARLAN. I will say that at the present time there are no other taxes and the tendency toward insurance companies is not to increase taxes. The effect of this will simply be to carry out what the insurance companies are actually paying at the present time and make both of these sections conform.

Mr. STAFFORD. Further reserving the right to object, how does the rate, as recommended by the committee, conform with the rates as paid in the States by insurance companies privileged to do business in those States?

Mr. HARLAN. It is very similar. The rates in the different States run about this way. I may say a number of them do not go as high as 1½ per cent, but there is this difference in the District of Columbia. Insurance companies pay no fee and are put to no expense in the District of Columbia for their annual examinations, which are made here free, and even though this rate of 1½ per cent is a little higher than in some jurisdictions, the rate is acceptable to the companies.

Mr. STAFFORD. Has the gentleman any information as to what the rate is in Ohio or Michigan or New York for doing business along this line?

Mr. HARLAN. I could not state that. At the time we had the hearings on this matter I had a representative of the corporation counsel at the hearing and also a representative of the insurance commissioner's office, and in my statement about the rates being substantially the same throughout the country, I am repeating what was given there by these gentlemen. I have not looked up any particular State and at the moment I can not give the gentleman what Ohio charges.

Mr. STAFFORD. I assume the gentleman is in sympathy with my idea that we should not give a preferential rate to insurance companies doing business here so as to invite insurance companies of other States to change their domicile in order to get the protecting arm of the local government.

Mr. HARLAN. There is no chance of that. I may say that section 650, which has been the law under which all insurance companies have been operating in the District and which is the law they all recognize, was passed in 1901. The only purpose of this act is to make section 653 conform to section 650. I think I can give the gentleman the history of this in just a moment. In 1901 these two sections were originally passed in the Code of the District of Columbia.

Mr. STAFFORD. I may say, parenthetically, that that was one year before I began service here and I am not acquainted with the legislation.

Mr. HARLAN. The history of it is short. I presume it is the only thing the gentleman can not remember. Section 653 as originally passed applied only to assessment life-insurance companies. Then in 1911 it was amended in an effort to make it apply to industrial insurance. The gentleman is familiar with that. The amendment was drawn in such broad terms that instead of being limited to assessment insurance and to industrial insurance, it was drawn so that it might be construed to cover all forms of life insurance. However, the insurance companies have not attempted to take advantage of this until just recently an opinion was asked of the commission, and the corporation counsel handed down an opinion that in all probability section 653 applied to life-insurance companies.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw the reservation of objection.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

On motion of Mrs. NORTON, a motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed was laid on the table.

SALE OF PROPERTY NO LONGER REQUIRED FOR PUBLIC PURPOSES
IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mrs. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I call up the bill (H. R. 14340) authorizing the sale of certain property no longer

required for public purposes in the District of Columbia, and ask unanimous consent that it be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole.

Mr. STAFFORD. Reserving the right to object, I have an amendment that I think will be acceptable to the committee. It is line 5, after the word "sale," to insert "at such time," the purpose being to leave it discretionary with the commissioners as to when the property shall be sold. In these times they might not be able to get the purchase price.

Mrs. NORTON. The committee will accept the amendment.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Commissioners of the District of Columbia be, and they are hereby, authorized and empowered to sell and convey to the highest bidder, at public or private sale, as in their opinion may be most advantageous to the District of Columbia, the old Potomac School property, lot 802 in square 327, containing 5,837 square feet of land, more or less. The proceeds from such sale shall be deposited in the United States Treasury to the credit of the District of Columbia.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, I offer the following amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

In line 5 after the comma following the word "sale," insert the words "and at such time."

Mrs. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. CASTELLOW] five minutes.

Mr. CASTELLOW. Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, several weeks ago there was some discussion before the House involving, to some extent at least, a consideration of the conditions and practices in the chain gang and penitentiary of Georgia.

It was not my intention to enter into this discussion and I would not except for the fact that I have just received a bit of evidence, rather persuasive, and in consideration of its high character and unprejudiced source should be convincing. It is in the form of a letter written by a man who has honored with his services as governor the splendid State of Michigan, but who resides at present in Georgia, the Hon. Chase S. Osborn. I quote from his letter as it appeared in the *Wiregrass Farmer*, a newspaper published in Ashburn, Ga.

Chase S. Osborn, former Governor of Michigan, in a recent letter to Gov. William A. Comstock, of Michigan, said: "There is no more reason to criticize the prison system in Georgia than in Michigan."

"For many years I have frequently visited Georgia chain-gang camps. I have gone especially on Sunday to hold services. I have observed the chain-gang system in all of its applied connections. In my opinion it is far better than keeping men at indoor labor. The only time there has been any roughness is where incorrigibles are concerned. The men are well fed, comfortably housed, and almost never manacled in the daytime. When camps are moving from place to place to do road work they do convey prisoners in portable cells which look like cages. There is no more reason to criticize the system in Georgia than in Michigan. Now and then there are human abuses in all the States.

"No man e'er felt the halter draw,
With good opinion of the law."

Mr. Osborn also inclosed a copy of a letter addressed to Patrick O'Brien, attorney general of Michigan, in which he added:

I have known convicts to commit crime so as to return to the chain gang where life for them has been more comfortable than so-called freedom.

The treatment of desperate criminals is perhaps kindlier in Georgia than in Michigan. Georgia compares with any State in the Union in the treatment of its prisoners. This may not be saying a great deal, but it does mean that Georgia ought not to be singled out in its penological policy. The convicts are not overworked. In the daytime they are in the pleasant open air and are well fed. At night they are comfortably housed.

Except for the fact that this distinguished gentleman has come to reside among us he, too, might have shared the erroneous idea that a State which contributed Button Gwinnett, Lyman Hall, and George Walton in the early days of our history to the cause of liberty and later did its part in formulating that matchless document, the Constitution of

the United States, had so forgotten its traditions and become so negligent of its duty to civilization as to play the rôle of an oppressor of the weak and a torturer of the unfortunate. Though the extent of our country is great and its inhabitants numerous, we have a common interest and cherish a common hope. In order that these may be promoted it behooves every State to cooperate for the enforcement of the law for the promotion of commerce and the reestablishment of prosperity within our borders. This is a herculean task, impossible of attainment without the hearty cooperation of a united people. It is, therefore, imperative that each State lend its support to the accomplishment of this purpose, thereby contributing as much as possible to a common cause. [Applause.]

The amendment of Mr. STAFFORD was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

LINCOLN'S BIRTHDAY

Mr. THATCHER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD by including therein an address delivered by our colleague the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. TAYLOR] at Nashville, Tenn., on Abraham Lincoln.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

ADDRESS OF HON. J. WILL TAYLOR, OF TENNESSEE, AT THE ANNUAL LINCOLN DAY BANQUET, MAXWELL HOUSE, NASHVILLE, TENN., FEBRUARY 11, 1933

Mr. Chairman and fellow Republicans, this is our fourth consecutive observance of the anniversary of the birth of the founder of our party, and it is, indeed, encouraging to note such a large attendance and such enthusiasm, despite the intemperate weather and the fact that we have just passed through the greatest ordeal in our party's entire history. Our heads may be bloody, my friends, but thank God "they are unbowed." We fought a clean fight, we kept faith with the American people, and our escutcheon is free from the stain of deception or misrepresentation.

We went before the country on a record of 12 years of honest, arduous, and constructive service, without apologies and without any effort to resort to the art of hocus-pocus or demagoguery. Our standard bearers courageously and unflinchingly faced the economic situation and demonstrated to those who were not distraught by partisan bias or hysteria that the Republican Party has met every exigency with fortitude and ability and has dealt with them with practical statesmanship instead of by art of legerdemain.

In my previous addresses on similar occasions I have devoted the major part of my remarks to our immortal patron saint. I shall not do so on this occasion, because this commanding figure in the world's history needs no encomiast. The marvelous and magnificent work of his heart and hand and brain, the innumerable volumes that have been written chronicling his imposing greatness, and the tons of bronze and marble statuary throughout the earth amply attest his place in history.

My remarks to-night will be confined to an effort to beguile you from the dismal wreckage of the last campaign to arouse your party interest and morale, and shall be in the nature of an exhortation to you to return to your tents and gird yourselves for the battle of the future.

Of course, we have suffered a most humiliating defeat. We were smitten "hip and thigh," as it were, by the enemy; but we should not be downcast or discouraged. There are worse things than defeat, my friends. Craven surrender and supine cowardice are far more dishonorable.

Every fair-minded person knows that extraordinary economic conditions, plus a campaign of wholesale misrepresentation and demagoguery of a type and magnitude hitherto unknown in this country caused our defeat. Conditions which every one knows were not of our making and for which we could not honestly be charged with responsibility, and which, as a matter of fact, had their origin in a Democratic administration, were so manipulated and exaggerated and dramatized by our opposition as to make it impossible for us to win. In addition to these unfair and reprehensible tactics on the part of our adversaries, they literally promised the earth and "the fullness thereof," and unfortunately the American people have been famous for their credulity and gullibility. Many years ago that great circus wizard, P. T. Barnum, discovered this trait in American character and cashed in on it; but even Barnum in his palmy days was a piker compared with some of the Democratic spellbinders of the last campaign.

But, my friends, the day of reckoning is at hand and it is now up to these political Houdinis to deliver. They boasted that their miracle man would immediately devise means to end unemployment in this country. God knows that in his efforts to this end Mr. Roosevelt shall have the unqualified sympathy and support of every patriotic American citizen; and yet, what concrete plan has he or his party suggested up to this good hour to bring about this much-desired objective?

They sold the country on the theory that most, if not all, of our ills are attributable to the Smoot-Hawley tariff law; and yet since the election not one of them has had the courage to advocate a downward revision of existing tariff schedules. In the face of their campaign declaration for free trade or its equivalent we recently beheld the spectacle of a Congress controlled by Democrats championing and passing a bill in the House of Representatives which absolutely places an embargo on many of our leading commodities. Verily, verily, I say unto you, the sophists of olden times certainly had nothing on these modern exponents of the gentle art of hokum and ballyhoo.

Notwithstanding the fact that that great idol of the Democratic Party, Andrew Jackson, recognized the logic of an effective and adequate protective tariff, the Democrats of to-day, who never tire singing the praises of Old Hickory, don't seem to have profited very much by the vigorous stand of this rugged old statesman on this vital American doctrine. Speaking in the United States Senate, of which he was a distinguished Member more than a hundred years ago, this great Tennessean, in discussing a tariff measure, thundered as follows: "It is time, sir, we should become a little more Americanized and, instead of feeding the paupers of England, feed our own people, or else in a short time we will be paupers ourselves."

But, Mr. Chairman, the man whose memory we revere to-night, in his usual quaint and homely style, gave perhaps the best example of the beneficence of a protective tariff. Being interrogated on the subject of tariffs, Abraham Lincoln is said to have replied that he knew very little about the tariff, but that he knew enough to know that when we bought steel rails abroad the foreigner had the money and we had the rails; but when we bought steel rails in America this country had the rails and the money also.

My friends, the necessity for a virile protective tariff was never more obvious than it is to-day, and the Democratic Party, with characteristic delinquency, is just beginning to react to the problem. Due to depreciated currencies in European and Asiatic countries, along with starvation wages paid their labor, our tariff wall has been practically nullified and destroyed. It is now generally known that unless immediate steps are taken to restore our tariff barriers, our country will become the dumping ground of cheap goods manufactured in foreign lands, which will inevitably result in the closing of thousands of American factories and the swelling of our already tremendous unemployed columns. Mr. Owen D. Young, that gallant knight of Democracy, declared during the campaign that the tariff was a dead issue and should be so considered. Recently, however, I understand that Mr. Young has been abruptly disillusioned, since the General Electric, of which he is the guiding spirit, has been forced to close two of its largest plants due to the importation of a flood of electric bulbs from Japan, where the yen has depreciated almost half in value and where labor can be had for 10 or 15 cents a day.

American financiers were horrified sometime ago when England and a number of other European countries went off the gold standard. Our financiers wondered why this drastic step was taken. But in the light of recent developments the reason is very apparent. It has been established that these nations went off the gold standard and debased their currency with the deliberate purpose of subverting and circumventing American tariff laws, and the success of the conspiracy is attested by the daily closing of American industries and incident idle machinery, smokeless stacks, and increased numbers of unemployed.

It seems to me that it ought to be apparent to everybody—even to "the wayfaring man, though he be a fool"—that in the face of foreign depreciated currencies, the Ottawa agreement between England and her dependencies, the quota system of France and the trade bars and restrictions of practically all of the European countries, in self-defense Uncle Sam must not only rebuild his tariff walls but must embark on a 100 per cent "buy American" policy.

In the Democratic convention which met in Chicago last spring, a platform was adopted emphatically declaring against a cancellation or reduction of the debts owed us by foreign governments, and Democratic orators during the campaign employed this plank in their platform with great facility and grandiloquence. These debts were negotiated by a Democratic administration, a large part of the loans being made without Congressional sanction and after the war was over. These obligations were contracted out of money derived from the sale of Liberty bonds to a confiding and patriotic American public, these bonds being outstanding to-day as a charge against our Federal Treasury.

What's going to become of these foreign obligations? Every taxpayer in the United States is interested and has a right to make this inquiry, because their cancellation or reduction means a corresponding burden upon the backs of an already overloaded taxpaying public.

Recently three or four of the debtor nations, with considerable reluctance, met their installments to Uncle Sam, but a number of others, including France, refused to meet their obligations, and in effect defaulted. Think of France refusing to pay her installment of \$19,000,000 on the ground that she could not afford it, and a few days later loaning to Austria \$14,000,000. Appropos of this action of the French Republic, one of her leading newspapers made this remarkable and significant comment: "Did we refuse our millions to the United States, to whom we owed something, if only gratitude, to give them to Austria, to whom we owed nothing except the shells she fired at us during the World War?"

My friends, I believe patriotism should always take precedence over partisanship. I am an American before I am a Republican. I want to see Mr. Roosevelt succeed in all of his laudable and legitimate undertakings, and I shall be the last person to throw any obstacles in his way. However, there is a feeling throughout the Nation that somebody or some influence, under cover and in some sinister and mysterious manner, is trying to juggle our foreign debts. European diplomats are very astute and clever, and it is said they do not stand back on scruples when the welfare of their country is at stake. Early in the Roosevelt administration a debt conference has already been scheduled. These foreign debtors are not sending their emissaries here to perform an idle or perfunctory ceremony. They expect results either in the form of outright cancellation, reduction, or indefinite suspension. Certainly it is perfectly proper for our Government to extend the courtesy of a conference to those debtor nations that had the honesty and the moral perspicuity to meet their obligations, but I think it amounts to downright stultification if we extend the same consideration to those nations now in default. The whole country is anxiously waiting to see if Mr. Roosevelt will do this.

Mr. Chairman, America stood aghast a few days ago when Mr. Roosevelt invited the Hon. Sir Ronald Lindsay, ambassador of Great Britain, for a conference at the Nation's temporary capital at Warm Springs, Ga. Many American people are wondering if Mr. Roosevelt is trying to emulate extraordinary and melancholy example of his distinguished predecessor, Mr. Wilson, who assayed the rôle of both President and ambassador. The American people will not soon forget what happened at Versailles in 1919, when President Wilson, with a gorgeous entourage, and as his own self-appointed ambassador, went to France and undertook to commit this country to the unholy and nefarious League of Nations. With bated breath the American people are wondering if Mr. Roosevelt is undertaking a similar stunt.

Mr. Chairman, the ethics of international diplomacy are quite well defined. Diplomatic correspondence and conversation are supposed to be carried on through chancelleries and departments of state with the knowledge and sanction of the executive. What would you think of our minister to the great Court of St. James taking up a diplomatic matter direct with King George, to the exclusion of the Hon. Ramsay McDonald? Of course, no one can criticize Ambassador Lindsay. He was invited by our President elect to our "southern capital," and it would have been a grave breach of the proprieties had he declined. It is interesting to note, however, that just as soon as the conference had concluded at Warm Springs the British ambassador took the first boat for London. We wonder just what message he transmitted from our President elect to His Majesty King George.

Stripped of its persiflage and its trappings, the naked proposition is this, Shall this eleven billion indebtedness be transferred from the shoulders of England, France, Italy, and the other debtor nations to the backs of the American taxpayer?

I do not particularly censure these debtor nations for their devious maneuvers in attempting to escape this burden if they can. This is simply human nature. Charity begins at home, and self-preservation is the first law of creation. Their attitude, however, reminds me of the story of the white man and the negro who went hunting. They killed a wild turkey and a buzzard, and at the end of the hunt they sat down to divide the spoils of the chase. The white man said nonchalantly: "Well, Rastus, I want to be perfectly fair with you. I'll take the turkey and you can have the buzzard, or you can have the buzzard and I'll take the turkey." Rastus, somewhat confused, said: "How's that, white folks?" The white man said again: "I'll take the turkey and you can have the buzzard, or you can have the buzzard and I'll take the turkey." After the proposition had been repeated several times, old Rastus finally said: "See here, white folks, how comes you never have said turkey to me?"

Mr. Chairman, I am among those Americans who contend and shall insist that these debtor nations say "turkey" to Uncle Sam at least half of the time.

And now, my friends, I desire to say in conclusion that I have thoroughly enjoyed every moment of this occasion. I always feel that I am a better Republican after attending a Lincoln dinner and after associating with those who never tire of paying tribute to the memory of our illustrious dead. Four times I have journeyed over 700 miles to pay my homage and respect to this sentiment, and in the interest of party solidarity and party success I want to see these annual ceremonies continued.

I would like to remain over a few days and visit with you and plan with you our future course of action, but on next Monday a tariff measure will come up in the House, and I want to be on hand to cast another vote for American labor, American industry, and American independence. I thank you.

MERGER OF STREET-RAILWAY CORPORATIONS, DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mrs. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I call up Senate Joint Resolution 248, to amend the joint resolution entitled "Joint resolution to authorize the merger of street-railway corporations operating in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes," approved January 14, 1933, and ask unanimous consent that it be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman from New Jersey calls up Senate Joint Resolution 248 and asks unani-

mous consent that it be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the resolution.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Senate Joint Resolution 248

Resolved, etc., That paragraph "Second" of the preamble of the joint resolution entitled "Joint resolution to authorize the merger of street-railway corporations operating in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes," approved January 14, 1933, is hereby amended to read as follows:

"Second. The new company shall be incorporated under the provisions of Subchapter IV of Chapter XVIII of the Code of Law of the District of Columbia and pursuant to an act of Congress entitled 'An act to permit the merger of street-railway corporations operating in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes,' approved March 4, 1925, with power subject to the approval of the Public Utilities Commission to acquire, construct, own, and operate directly transit properties within the District of Columbia and either directly or through subsidiaries in adjacent States, including the power to acquire, own, and operate the properties to be conveyed to the new company in accordance with this agreement, and to acquire and own the stock and/or bonds of said companies and of any other company or companies engaged in the transportation of passengers by street railway or bus in the District of Columbia and adjacent States with the power to mortgage its property, rights, and franchises, and to conduct such other activities as may be useful or necessary in connection with or incident to the foregoing purposes, including the power to buy, sell, hold, own, and convey real estate within and without the District of Columbia. Said new company when incorporated shall become and remain subject in all respects to regulation by the Public Utilities Commission of the District of Columbia or its successors to the extent of the jurisdiction now or hereafter vested in it or them by law over corporations engaged in the transportation of passengers by street railway or bus within the District of Columbia: *Provided*, That before they are recorded, the articles of incorporation and/or any amendments thereto shall be approved by the Public Utilities Commission."

Sec. 2. That Congress hereby expressly reserves the right to alter, amend, or repeal this resolution.

Mrs. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLANTON].

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I have called attention several times to the fact that the charters of both of these street-railway companies provide that they shall never charge the people of Washington more than 5 cents car fare. There was a time when they obeyed those charter provisions. There was a time when they sold six tickets for a quarter; and when they were selling six tickets for a quarter and obeying their charter provisions they were making money. Every car that was sent out of the barn was filled up most of the time before it ever reached its other terminus and people were hanging onto straps in the cars. I have seen carload after carload pass down the Avenue so full that there was not standing room in them, and so have others who have been here for a long time.

A bill was pending before the Zihlman committee—I do not know whether I ought to mention the Zihlman committee because the reputation of the District Committee has improved wonderfully in the last few years—to require those street-railway companies to stay within their charter provisions and to go back to a 5-cent fare. The street-railway companies came there and fought the bill and killed it, and killed it year after year. We told them then, when they had their general attorneys present, as well as the presidents of their companies and some of their big stockholders, that if they just had business sense enough to quit charging the people of Washington 8 cents, and 7½ cents when they bought tokens, and would go back to a 5-cent fare with six tokens for a quarter, they would double their revenue; and we told them further that if they did not do it, sooner or later, they would find themselves losing business here in Washington, and that prediction has come true. I got on one of the street cars the other night at the House Office Building and there was not a soul on it except the motorman and the conductor. I rode all the way to the Raleigh Hotel on Pennsylvania Avenue before another passenger got on the car.

It is because they have been mulcting the people here with a 7½-cent car fare that the people of Washington quit riding the street cars and have gone to the taxicab.

That is the reason you find such a fight being made on cheap taxicab service. Four women, working in a department, or four men, for that matter, although I mention the women, because it is of more interest to them, can get in a taxicab at their homes and go to their offices to work and it costs them 20 cents, 5 cents each, and they can get a taxicab after they quit work to take them to their homes for 5 cents apiece. That is the reason they have quit riding on these street cars at 7½ cents. They can get a taxicab to take them right to their homes from their place of work for less money. Any person on earth with a grain of common business sense here in the city of Washington, except the management of these street-railway companies, can see at a glance that if they would go back to their charter provisions and grant a 5-cent fare as they ought to do, with six tokens for a quarter as they used to, they would double and treble their present patronage, and thereby increase, almost double, their present income. Why they do not do that, and why they can not see that, I do not understand.

But I rose really to talk about the taxicab situation here in the city of Washington. There are several thousand taxicabs in Washington, and there are 1,500 ex-service men who for the last year and a half have been driving taxicabs, who have been making enough to support their families, not in luxury, but to support them, to furnish a roof over their heads, something that they did not have for two or three years before that time, and to furnish their wives and little children with food and clothing, sufficient to keep them from suffering. Does not that mean something?

However, there is a deplorable situation existing here as to accidents. I want you to bear in mind that I am one of those who have been fighting for these independent taxicabs. I am one of those who believe that no monopoly like the old Black and White or the Yellow taxicabs should be permitted to run men off the streets and keep them from making an honest living.

We have a deplorable situation here with several thousand taxicab drivers. Many of them are irresponsible. Not a single move has been made here to require them to protect the safety of the riding public with liability insurance.

Mr. TAYLOR of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLANTON. Yes.

Mr. TAYLOR of Tennessee. I am in entire sympathy with the gentleman's position, and I think it is entirely logical. How do these street-railway companies escape these charter obligations?

Mr. BLANTON. The authorities here permit them to do so. I went to the Public Utilities Commission, to Chairman Patrick, and I said to him, "General, why don't you require taxicabs to take out liability insurance?" He said that he could not do it without an act of Congress. He said he had to have an act of Congress to give him authority to do it. I do not believe that, because I think that he has authority now to do it, but he will not exert that authority without an act of Congress.

I hope the gentleman from New York [Mr. BLACK], the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HARLAN], the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. PALMISANO], and the chairman of the District Committee the lady from New Jersey [Mrs. NORTON] will not let 10 days pass before they report a proper bill from their committee and pass it which will give the Utilities Commission the power and authority to require proper liability insurance on every taxicab that operates in the District of Columbia.

Mrs. NORTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLANTON. I yield.

Mrs. NORTON. I will be glad to grant a hearing to the gentleman on any bill he desires to submit.

Mr. BLANTON. I do not want a hearing. I am not going to spend my time at any such hearing. I am too busy. It ought to appeal to the committee just as it appeals to me. If they think it is proper or right, all my good friend has to do is to phone down and have the commissioners send up a proper bill, and it could be passed with the help of these gentlemen in about two hours' time.

Mrs. NORTON. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. BLANTON. Certainly.

Mrs. NORTON. I understood that power was entirely in the hands of the Public Utilities Commission.

Mr. BLANTON. But General Patrick says he has not the power. He says the corporation counsel has told him he has not the authority. He wants to do it. The commissioners want to do it, but they say they need a bill from Congress.

Permit me to call attention to another thing. Do you know there is not a taxicab company in the city that is responsible? Name one.

Mrs. NORTON. The Diamond, I think, is.

Mr. BLANTON. Possibly the Diamond is.

Mrs. NORTON. I understand they are.

Mr. BLANTON. That is just one. How about the Black and White, and Yellow? They are not. There are some Members of Congress who have good, valid claims against them who can not collect a dollar. They have been threatening to go into bankruptcy whenever they start to push their claims. I am informed there is not a single one in Washington, except possibly the Diamond, upon which you could collect a \$5,000 judgment. I am not sure. Possibly the Diamond Co. may be, but is it not a terrible situation when there are about 4,000 taxicabs in the District of Columbia, many of them operated by irresponsible people, that there is only one company that is responsible?

Let us admit the Diamond Co. is responsible, for the sake of the argument. Why should not the rest of them be responsible? Why should not everyone that operates be responsible, so that if they run over some little child or some old man or some decrepit woman they can be made to pay for it? They ought to be made to pay for it. So why do we not give proper authority to the Public Utilities Commission? Let me tell you what happened the other day. This matter appealed so to our subcommittee which was preparing the bill on the District of Columbia appropriations that the subcommittee agreed to require that.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mrs. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman five additional minutes.

Mr. BLANTON. We had a proper amendment prepared in the general counsel's office. We agreed on such an amendment in the subcommittee and we agreed we would put it in the bill, to authorize General Patrick, chairman of the Public Utilities Commission, to provide for certain liability insurance for every taxicab. It came out in the papers, and the taxicabs made such a hue and cry and the papers began to fight it before it ever got started, and they killed it. They brought so much pressure to bear on that question that that provision was taken out of the bill. Why? Because the taxicab companies did not want it. Do you know there are three Members right now who have just claims amounting to \$5,000 against these taxicabs and they can not collect a 5-cent piece? Did you know that? Their claims are on account of serious accidents, and they can not collect a 5-cent piece. Did you know that? There are accidents happening every day caused by irresponsible cab drivers. They say it will put some of them off of the streets if we require insurance. Well, what if it does? I want cheap taxicab service, but I want safe taxicab service first for the people. I want that service to be safe so that it does not threaten and menace the life of every little child and every old woman and every decrepit old man in the District. If it will put them off the streets, let them be put off. Make them give a proper liability bond before they can drive on the streets of the National Capital and cripple and maim and murder innocent people.

Mr. HARLAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLANTON. I yield. Is the gentleman going to help us?

Mr. HARLAN. I am going to do the best I can, but there are a number of objections that I do not think the gentleman from Texas has thought about. In the first place, in the last appropriation bill the gentleman from Texas introduced an amendment preventing the District Commis-

sioners from compelling taxicabs to adopt a reasonable rate that would pay them to put in meters.

Mr. BLANTON. Now, wait a moment. I want to answer that first.

Mr. HARLAN. I have not come to the point of my question yet.

Mr. BLANTON. Well, I want to answer that first. In the first place, I did not introduce that amendment. In the second place, it was introduced by the chairman of the committee the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. BYRNS]. In the third place, it was adopted unanimously by the House, and in the fourth place, the only thing on earth it did was to prevent General Patrick from putting a meter system in Washington that would put the Black and White, and Diamond, and Yellow monopolies on the streets, and run out of business every other taxicab operator, and permit the Black and White, and Yellow, and Diamonds to charge, under their meters, for going from here to the Washington or the Raleigh or the Willard Hotel \$1.50 instead of 20 cents. And we would not stand for it. That, however, does not keep us from providing for the public a safe, proper, liability policy, which does not cost them very much.

I am forced to keep two cars here—one a small work car and one for my constituents. I carry liability insurance on both of them. I think the insurance on my Cadillac car costs \$85 a year and on my Ford car it costs \$24 a year. If either one of my cars hurts a person, regardless of my personal responsibility, my policy protects him. I would not let a car of mine be driven anywhere that was not covered by proper liability insurance to protect an individual should he be hurt by it.

In the District of Columbia we ought to require every taxicab to be properly insured. The cost of this insurance would not be so very much. I hope the committee will give favorable consideration to this suggestion.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman from New Jersey yield me five minutes?

Mrs. NORTON. I shall be pleased to. I wish to announce at this time that we have a great many bills to be considered. I do not wish to be considered arbitrary but I shall be compelled to object to further requests for time.

Mr. STAFFORD. Were it not for the conversion of the gentleman from Texas to the need of some regulation of the taxicab situation in the District of Columbia, I would not arise at this moment to take the time to discuss the taxicab situation.

I believe even the person most casually acquainted with the taxicab situation here will agree that there is need of regulation. The gentleman from Texas advocates placing them under surety liability. This is not sufficient. This will not curtail to any extent the many taxicabs that are now floating on the public highways without regulation.

I think the gentleman from Ohio should be commended in his efforts at the last session of Congress to try to inaugurate the meter system applicable to all taxicabs in operation in the city.

Further, as to the question of surety liability, I may acquaint the gentlewoman from New Jersey, if she wishes to occupy any time in its consideration in the few remaining days of the session, with the fact that in the last Congress the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. REED] introduced a bill placing all taxicabs under surety liability. It was not brought up for consideration. There is urgent need for more regulation than simply placing them under surety liability. They should be placed under the control of the Utilities Commission. The Public Utilities Commission should have control of the operation of the taxicabs. We should not let every Tom, Dick, and Harry run cabs, and these names are applicable to the operators of the many, many taxicabs now in operation in Washington. There is no regulation of them to-day. They are preoccupying the thoroughfares of the city, mowing down life recklessly without any regard to the human equation. There is urgent need now to have them placed under some regulation of the Utilities Commission.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The Senate joint resolution was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

On motion of Mrs. NORRAN, a motion to reconsider the vote by which the joint resolution was passed was laid on the table.

GEORGE N. NICHOLSON

Mrs. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I call up the bill (H. R. 13867) to authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to reappoint George N. Nicholson in the police department of said District, and ask that a similar Senate bill (S. 5289) be substituted therefor, and ask that the Senate bill be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Commissioners of the District of Columbia be, and they are hereby, authorized and empowered, in their discretion, to reappoint George N. Nicholson as a member of the Metropolitan police department of the District of Columbia, and his compensation to commence from the date of such reappointment, no pay or compensation to be paid the said George N. Nicholson from the date of his dismissal from the Metropolitan police department to the date of any such reappointment.

The Senate bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

On motion of Mrs. NORTON, a motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed was laid on the table.

A similar House bill was laid on the table.

TEACHERS' SALARIES

Mrs. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I call up the bill (H. R. 12595) to amend the teachers' salary act of the District of Columbia, approved June 4, 1924, as amended, in relation to establishing the Wilson and Miner Teachers Colleges on a basis comparable with recognized standards for accredited institutions of like kind; to raising the trade or vocational schools to the level of junior high schools, and for other purposes, and ask that it be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, will the gentlewoman explain the real purpose of the bill? It is a rather lengthy bill and fixes the respective salaries of various teachers, principals, librarians, and the like. Wherein does it change existing law?

I may say, and I do not say this in any desire to criticize, that nearly every bill that has been presented for consideration here to-day is vacuous so far as containing any recommendation from the District Commissioners. The Members of the House, without making specific inquiry in each instance, do not know the attitude of the District Commissioners with regard to the respective measures.

Mrs. NORTON. I may say to the gentleman from Wisconsin that I introduced this bill at the request of the Commissioners of the District; and I may further say that in every instance I have submitted our bills to the commissioners to get their reports, and when the report has been against the bill I have not submitted the bill to the House. I have been very careful about this.

Mr. STAFFORD. I may say to the gentlewoman from New Jersey that it has been customary for the clerk of the committee making these reports to append thereto the letter containing the views of the commissioners.

A moment ago we had up the question of changing the taxing policy of the District of Columbia, but there was nothing in the report to show the views of the commissioners in respect thereto, and their views were not developed until we got into the discussion of the bill.

In this case there is nothing to show what the views of the Commissioners of the District are.

Mrs. NORTON. I may say to the gentleman from Wisconsin that this bill was introduced at the request of the

Commissioners of the District. Therefore, of necessity, they must approve the bill.

Mr. STAFFORD. Yes; but those communications from the commissioners usually contain an argument that is influential in shaping the opinion of the House on various legislation.

Mrs. NORTON. I think if the gentleman will consult the report he will find that there is contained therein indirect approval by the commissioners. They referred the bill to the board of education, who in turn submitted approval to this committee.

Mr. STAFFORD. What change is made in the bill?

Mrs. NORTON. As I understand this bill, its purpose is to bring these business high schools up to the level of the junior high schools; it is simply conforming to the accepted thought of the school system in practically every large community in the country.

Mr. STAFFORD. Are we to understand that the present so-called teachers colleges are now being administered under different laws than those which now apply to our junior high schools, so far as salaries are concerned?

Mrs. NORTON. Yes; that is my understanding; and this bill is intended to bring them up to the same level with the junior high schools of the District of Columbia.

Mr. STAFFORD. Are the principals in these teachers colleges under civil service?

Mrs. NORTON. I do not know.

Mr. GOSS. Will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. NORTON. Yes.

Mr. GOSS. Section 13 states:

The appointments, assignments, and transfers of teachers, principals, and presidents authorized in this act shall be made in accordance with the act approved June 20, 1906.

Does that take these teachers out of civil service?

Mrs. NORTON. I do not think so. The gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. GASQUE] held hearings on this bill, and it is most unfortunate that he is not here to-day, as he could probably answer all questions much better than I.

Mr. GOSS. Are you familiar with Public, No. 254? That is in section 13. My only point is whether they are now under civil service.

Mrs. NORTON. I understand that that has to do solely with the teachers' salaries.

Mr. GOSS. It says it has to do only with salaries and not the qualifications.

Mrs. NORTON. That is my understanding.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, as this relates to the District and every one of the commissioners favors it, I am not going to offer any opposition to its consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That it is the purpose of this act to establish the Wilson and Miner Teachers Colleges in accordance with recognized standards for accredited institutions of like kind, as to salary schedule, library staff, library facilities, and the secretarial and clerical staff of the central office; to raise the trade or vocational schools from the present elementary-school level to the rank of junior high schools, as to salary schedule; and to provide other necessary legislation relating thereto.

Sec. 2. That on and after July 1, 1932, the salaries of teachers and presidents of the Wilson and the Miner Teachers Colleges shall be as follows:

CLASS 3—INSTRUCTORS

Group A. A basic salary of \$1,800 per year, with an annual increase in salary of \$100 for 10 years, or until a maximum salary of \$2,800 per year is reached.

Group B. A basic salary of \$2,900 per year, with an annual increase in salary of \$100 for three years, or until a maximum salary of \$3,200 per year is reached.

CLASS 11—ASSISTANT PROFESSORS

A basic salary of \$3,200 per year, with an annual increase in salary of \$100 for five years, or until a maximum salary of \$3,700 per year is reached.

CLASS 12—PROFESSORS

A basic salary of \$4,000 per year, with an annual increase in salary of \$100 for five years, or until a maximum salary of \$4,500 per year is reached.

PRESIDENTS

A basic salary of \$5,000 per year, with an annual increase in salary of \$200 for five years, or until a maximum salary of \$6,000 per year is reached.

Sec. 3. That on and after July 1, 1932, the salaries of teachers and principals of the trade or vocational schools shall be as follows:

CLASS 1—TEACHERS

Group A. A basic salary of \$1,400 per year, with an annual increase in salary of \$100 for eight years, or until a maximum salary of \$2,200 per year is reached.

Group B. A basic salary of \$2,300 per year, with an annual increase in salary of \$100 for three years, or until a maximum salary of \$2,600 per year is reached.

CLASS 2—TEACHERS

Group A. A basic salary of \$1,600 per year, with an annual increase in salary of \$100 for eight years, or until a maximum salary of \$2,400 per year is reached.

Group B. A basic salary of \$2,500 per year, with an annual increase in salary of \$100 for three years, or until a maximum salary of \$2,800 per year is reached.

Group C. A basic salary of \$1,800 per year, with an annual increase in salary of \$100 for 10 years, or until a maximum salary of \$2,800 per year is reached.

Group D. A basic salary of \$2,900 per year, with an annual increase in salary of \$100 for three years, or until a maximum salary of \$3,200 per year is reached.

CLASS 8—PRINCIPALS

A basic salary of \$3,500 per year, with an annual increase in salary of \$100 for five years, or until a maximum salary of \$4,000 per year is reached.

Sec. 4. That on and after July 1, 1932, the salaries of librarians in the teachers college shall be as follows:

CHIEF LIBRARIAN

A basic salary of \$3,200 per year, with an annual increase in salary of \$100 for five years, or until a maximum salary of \$3,700 per year is reached.

ASSISTANT LIBRARIAN

A basic salary of \$1,800 per year, with an annual increase in salary of \$100 for 10 years, or until a maximum salary of \$2,800 per year is reached.

LIBRARY ASSISTANTS

A basic salary of \$1,400 per year, with an annual increase in salary of \$100 for eight years, or until a maximum salary of \$2,200 per year is reached.

Sec. 5. That the board of education is hereby authorized, empowered, and directed to classify and assign the teachers and presidents in the service in the teachers colleges on July 1, 1932, to the salary classes and positions in the foregoing salary schedule for said teachers colleges, in accordance with such rules as the board of education may prescribe, and also to classify and assign the teachers and principals in the service in trade or vocational schools on July 1, 1932, to the salary classes and positions in the foregoing salary schedule for said trade or vocational schools in accordance with such rules as the Board of Education may prescribe.

Sec. 6. That the Board of Education is hereby authorized, empowered, and directed to establish such new positions in the teachers colleges, in addition to those hereinbefore specified, as may be considered necessary by the Board of Education for the proper operation of the teachers colleges and to assign any such new position to one of the salary classes hereinbefore provided.

Sec. 7. That the Board of Education is hereby authorized, empowered, and directed to employ in the teachers colleges, under and within appropriations made by Congress, such part-time employees in addition to the regular faculty as may be considered necessary by the Board of Education for the proper operation of the teachers colleges; and to establish the qualifications, terms of service, and salaries to be paid such part-time employees.

Sec. 8. Professors and assistant professors are hereby classified as teachers, and their salaries shall be paid in 10 monthly installments as provided in Public Act No. 139, Sixtieth Congress, approved May 26, 1908.

Sec. 9. The Board of Education is hereby authorized to confer appropriate degrees on those persons who, in the judgment of the respective faculties and the Board of Education, satisfactorily complete the prescribed course of study in the Wilson and Miner Teachers Colleges.

Sec. 10. That the Board of Education is hereby authorized to appoint, in the manner prescribed by law, the necessary stenographic and clerical staff in the central office of the Wilson and the Miner Teachers Colleges, in accordance with at least the minimum standards established for accredited teachers colleges.

Sec. 11. That the Board of Education shall submit annually to the Commissioners of the District of Columbia estimates of appropriations necessary to maintain the libraries and the stenographic and clerical staff in the Wilson and Miner Teachers Colleges, at least at the minimum standards established for accredited teachers colleges.

Sec. 12. That the Board of Education is authorized and empowered to establish occupational schools on the elementary-school level for pupils not prepared to pursue vocational courses in the trade or vocational schools; and also to carry on trade or vocational courses on the senior high-school level or in senior high schools.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike out the last word to call attention to the authority vested with the Board of Education by section 12. Is it intended by this section to allow the Board of Education to establish such occupational schools as they may deem needed?

Mrs. NORTON. I believe that is the intention.

Mr. STAFFORD. I am not sufficiently versed with the condition of our school system here to know whether there are any occupational schools in the District of Columbia. I question whether here in the capital, where we do not put a premium on industries or trades, there would be need of occupational schools.

Mrs. NORTON. We have such a school here in the District of Columbia—the McKinley Technical School.

Mr. STAFFORD. That is not really an occupational school. That is a manual training school and there are many manual training schools throughout the country, but an occupational school, as I understand the term, is a school where they teach the youth trades and the like. They are usually schools which are given over to instruction of children after their work hours, sometimes prescribing one day every week when they are to be employed in such occupational training as printing, plumbing, and the like. I know in my home city we have a very large occupational school attended by the thousands. I was not acquainted, from following the District of Columbia appropriation bills, with any school similar to this here in the District. I suppose the purpose of this section is to authorize the Board of Education to establish such an occupational school.

Mrs. NORTON. I think it is the intention to authorize such a school. It has been found necessary, I understand, here in the District.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment merely for the purpose of asking some questions to get the legislative intent with respect to these basic salaries. For instance, on page 2, line 19, in providing basic salary for professors, the basic salary is fixed at \$4,000 per year, with an annual increase in salary of \$100 per year for five years. To get the legislative intent in the RECORD, it is understood that, to get the benefit of this \$100 per year, they start in at a basic salary of \$4,000 and must teach one year before they are entitled to another \$100.

Mrs. NORTON. Yes.

Mr. BLANTON. In other words, before they can get this \$500 additional they must teach five years from the date this bill becomes law.

Mrs. NORTON. That is my understanding of the bill.

Mr. BLANTON. They can not compute their years of teaching which they have had prior to the enactment of this bill as increasing their basic salary.

Mrs. NORTON. Oh, no.

Mr. BLANTON. This is true with respect to all the other teachers and true with respect to the president, where the basic salary is fixed at \$5,000 per year with an annual increase of \$200 for five years. He must act as president for five years after this bill becomes law before he is entitled to this maximum salary.

Mrs. NORTON. That is my understanding of the bill.

Mr. BLANTON. Further, to get the legislative intent, with regard to the librarians, we provide for a chief librarian at \$3,200, with an annual increase in salary of \$100 for five years, making the maximum \$3,700. We provide for assistant librarian at \$1,800 with an annual increase of \$100 for 10 years, making the maximum salary \$2,800 a year. We provide for other library assistants, with a basic salary of \$1,400, with an annual increase in salary of \$100 for eight years, making a maximum salary of \$2,200. In order to express the legislative intent here, it is understood that in passing these bills they must serve these extra years before they get these extra allowances and they can not compute their previous service as librarians anywhere in getting these increases. This is understood, is it not?

Mrs. NORTON. Yes.

Mr. BLANTON. Is it not true that the sum of \$3,700 a year is a pretty high salary for the librarian of a school?

Mrs. NORTON. I think it conforms with the salaries in other cities of the same size.

Mr. BLANTON. I have made some investigation of similar salaries that are paid all over the United States. Does the gentlewoman from New Jersey realize that there are many librarians serving in Carnegie libraries in cities for \$1,800 and less a year?

Mrs. NORTON. Oh, yes.

Mr. BLACK. And they are generally considered to be underpaid.

Mr. BLANTON. Some of the best women in the world are serving as librarians in Carnegie libraries in the large cities. If you can get a splendid woman who is trained as a librarian to serve as a librarian in a Carnegie library for \$1,800, why should you pay a librarian in one of these schools here \$3,700 a year, and this is just one of the many similar schools here in Washington.

Mr. BLACK. Generally speaking, I think it is a shame the way the librarians of the country have been treated. There is no finer type of mind needed than that required of a librarian, to do selective work in helping the readers and students, and it is a crime that they are so underpaid. However, I agree with the gentleman on the general proposition that if this is the schedule generally we should not go above it.

Mr. BLANTON. I doubt the wisdom of making these salaries as large as they are. I am against it. I want my friend from New York and the gentlewoman from New Jersey to go to the Congressional Library, one of the greatest libraries in the world, and investigate the measly little starvation salaries that most of the splendid employees of that institution work for now.

Mr. BLACK. We agree with the gentleman about that.

Mr. BLANTON. I know some splendid women who have been working in that library for a number of years who are not now getting more than \$1,200 a year. When we permit this in the Congressional Library, I think it is out of line to pay the librarians in one of these schools as much as \$3,700 a year.

Mrs. NORTON. May I say to the gentleman that I think the qualifications required are quite different and this probably accounts for the difference in salary.

The pro forma amendment was withdrawn.

The Clerk completed the reading of the bill as follows:

Sec. 13. The appointments, assignments, and transfers of teachers, principals, and presidents authorized in this act shall be made in accordance with the act approved June 20, 1906, as amended (Public, No. 254).

Sec. 14. This act shall take effect on July 1, 1932.

The Clerk read the following committee amendments:

Page 2, line 4, strike out the figures "1932" and insert "1933." Page 7, line 5, strike out "1932" and insert "1933."

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the amendment. The thought occurs to me that by the enactment of this bill at this session these teachers will be exempt from the congressional cut carried in the economy bill. I want to ask the legal adviser of the committee what is his opinion about it?

Mr. PALMISANO. I may say—

Mr. STAFFORD. I am not referring to the gentleman from Baltimore, who is the liquid adviser, but I am referring to the gentleman from Ohio, the dry adviser on legal matters. [Laughter.]

Mrs. NORTON. I do not think this has anything to do with the economy act.

Mr. STAFFORD. That is it; it has nothing to do with the economy act, but all the other officers are leveled down $8\frac{1}{2}$ per cent.

Mrs. NORTON. I think that all the cuts will apply to this bill.

Mr. HARLAN. That would depend upon the wording of the economy act.

Mr. STAFFORD. This is a later act fixing the salaries. I am glad to have the opinion of the legal adviser that the economy act would not apply to these salaries.

Mr. HARLAN. I would not be sure of it.

Mr. PALMISANO. There may be something to the contention of the gentleman from Wisconsin, this being a subsequent act to the economy bill. It may be that it may not apply.

Mr. STAFFORD. I think the opinion of the legal adviser is worth more than the liquid adviser. [Laughter.]

The amendments were agreed to.

Mrs. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the bill and amendments to final passage.

The previous question was ordered.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

NOTICE OF DAMAGE CLAIMS

Mrs. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I call up the bill (H. R. 13750) to regulate the bringing of action for damages against the District of Columbia, and for other purposes, and ask unanimous consent that it be considered in the House in Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That no action shall be maintained against the District of Columbia for unliquidated damages to person or property unless the claimant shall allege and prove that within 30 days after the injury or damage was sustained, he, his agent, or attorney gave notice in writing to the Commissioners of the District of Columbia of the time, place, cause, and extent of such injury or damage.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 5, strike out the words "shall allege and prove that" following the word "claimant."

Page 1, line 5, strike out the words "30 days" following the word "within" and insert in lieu thereof the words "six months."

Page 1, line 8, after the words "of the District of Columbia of the," insert the word "approximate," so that the line will read "of the District of Columbia of the approximate time, place, cause, and."

Page 1, line 9, strike the first word "extent" and insert in lieu thereof the word "circumstances."

Page 1, line 9, at the end of the bill and after the word "damage," strike out the period and insert in lieu thereof a colon and add the following: "Provided, however, That a report in writing by the Metropolitan police department in the regular course of duty shall be regarded as a sufficient notice under this act."

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, will some member of the committee inform the House as to the reason for extending the time for giving notice from 30 days to 6 months? I believe it is customary to have a much more limited time than six months in which to give notice of action to the municipality.

Mr. PALMISANO. Mr. Speaker, as I understand it at the present time it is unlimited. The District was recently sued on an accident which happened about five years ago. The commissioners came in and asked that a 30-day notice be required. I objected to that, and inserted 6 months, and also a proviso that a regular report by the Metropolitan police would be a sufficient notice to protect the District. I had in mind, in extending the time from 30 days to 6 months, the interest of the person who would not be familiar with the law, and who might be in the hospital for 6 months, and by adding the provision that a report of the police department would be sufficient notice, that would also protect the unfortunate who might be compelled to go to a hospital, because I believe in all those cases the police do make a report, and that would also protect the District.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, directing attention to the subsequent proposal just referred to, that a report in writing by the Metropolitan police department shall be regarded as sufficient notice, or that it shall be equivalent to a notice served by the claimant, if there happens to be some report by a police force, would that be sufficient so that the claimant would not be obliged to give any notice at all?

Mr. PALMISANO. That is right.

Mr. STAFFORD. Let us consider that for a moment. I do not think that you are protecting the District in that way. Suppose a police officer makes a casual report of a crossing accident. The claimant may allow years to go by before he begins his action. Certainly the gentleman does

not wish to allow a claimant that much leeway. The whole purpose of this type of legislation is to force the claimant to begin action within a certain limited time.

Mr. BLACK. This is not a statute of limitations proposition; it is simply a notice proposition.

Mr. STAFFORD. Yes; it is a matter of a limitation. The bill provides that no action shall be maintained for damages unless the claimant within six months from the injury shall give notice in writing, and so forth.

Mr. BLACK. This is purely a notice proposition. It makes no difference where the notice comes from. It is much better for the District that it comes from the police department because it would be more authentic.

Mr. STAFFORD. I am not informed in respect to the statute of limitations prescribed by the District, in which to begin such actions, but in the State of Wisconsin it is prescribed that the action must be begun within a year.

Mr. BLACK. This is not a limitation proposition.

Mr. STAFFORD. I am inquiring whether there should not be a limitation.

Mr. BLACK. They have to put the District on notice as to the accident, and, after having given notice, it may be that no action may be brought.

Mr. STAFFORD. But when a policeman makes a casual report of a crossing accident there is no intimation given to the commissioners that action is going to be begun, whereas if the person injured within the 6-month period gives notice it is presumed that he intends to follow it up by suit.

Mr. BLACK. On the contrary, if the person injured relies on the policeman's report and does not begin suit within the terms of the bill, he is out of court.

Mr. STAFFORD. Where is there anything of that kind in this bill? It reads:

Provided, however, That a report in writing by the Metropolitan police department—

Mr. BLACK. Shall be notice. Notice of what? Of time and place—not a casual report that an accident happened but an adequate notice to the District.

Mr. STAFFORD. Where is the word "adequate"?

Mr. BLACK. Adequacy in time and place.

Mr. STAFFORD. The word "adequate" is not in the bill.

Mr. BLACK. I am reading the word "adequate" into the element of time and place. The corporation counsel prepared this bill and it is in the form that the commissioners want it.

Mr. STAFFORD. I doubt if it is in the form that the District Commissioners want it, because the vitals have been cut out of it by the proviso.

Mr. PALMISANO. The proviso was agreed to by the corporation counsel. He prepared it.

Mr. BLACK. They would be glad to have any legislation.

Mr. STAFFORD. I think the District is going to suffer by reason of this suggested proviso and that it would be far better to have it limited to six months and have the claimant give notice of the injury, which presupposes that he intends to follow it up with action in court.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the first amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 1, line 5, after the word "claimant," strike out the words "shall allege and prove that within 30 days," and insert "within six months."

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 1, line 9, at the beginning of the line, insert the word "approximate," and strike out the word "extent" and insert the word "circumstances."

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the next amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 2, after the word "damage," insert "Provided, however, That a report in writing by the Metropolitan police department, in regular course of duty, shall be regarded as a sufficient notice under the above provision."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

The bill as amended was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider laid on the table.

MERGER OF THE GEORGETOWN GAS LIGHT CO.

Mrs. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I call up the bill (H. R. 13853) to authorize the merger of the Georgetown Gaslight Co. with and into Washington Gas Light Co., and for other purposes, and I ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered in the House as in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from New Jersey [Mrs. NORTON]?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Public Utilities Commission of the District of Columbia is given jurisdiction and power to permit and authorize the Georgetown Gaslight Co. and Washington Gas Light Co. to consolidate or merge upon such conditions as may be approved by the said commission, provided the said commission shall determine that such consolidation or merger will be in the public interest; and upon such consolidation or merger said the Georgetown Gaslight Co. shall thereby and thereupon, without further proceedings, be and become forthwith dissolved and merged into the said Washington Gas Light Co., and all the property of every kind, character, and description, rights, privileges, and franchises of said the Georgetown Gaslight Co. shall, subject to encumbrances or liens thereon to secure the bonds or other securities issued by said the Georgetown Gaslight Co., and to the payment of any and all other valid claims against or indebtedness of the Georgetown Gaslight Co. existing at the time of such merger, pass to and unto and become and be vested in the said Washington Gas Light Co. as its property, with all the powers, rights, privileges, and franchises now possessed by either or both of said companies, including the right in the said Washington Gas Light Co. to institute and prosecute in its own name any action or actions in connection therewith: *Provided, however,* That pending actions against the Georgetown Gaslight Co. may continue against the Georgetown Gaslight Co. until the merger of said companies. Actions or claims against said the Georgetown Gaslight Co. filed after the said merger shall be brought against the Washington Gas Light Co.

Washington Gas Light Co., after such merger, shall have the right and franchise to lay and construct, and to extend, maintain, renew, replace, relocate, remove, and/or repair, whether now or hereafter laid or constructed, gas pipes and mains, together with all appurtenances, connections, attachments, and appliances, in, under, along, and/or across the streets, avenues, roads, alleys, lanes, and other public places and ways in all parts of the District of Columbia for the transmission, distribution, and/or sale of gas within and/or through the limits of the District of Columbia for heat, light, refrigeration, fuel, power, and any other purposes for which gas or any by-product thereof is now or may hereafter be used; subject, however, to the provisions of the act of June 11, 1878, entitled "An act providing a permanent form of government for the District of Columbia"; to the provisions of the act of March 3, 1893, entitled "An act making appropriations for the expenses of the government of the District of Columbia for the fiscal year 1894"; of section 8 (public utilities law) of the act of March 4, 1913; and any other laws or regulations applicable thereto.

Sec. 2. For the purpose of enabling Washington Gas Light Co. to provide for extensions to its distribution system, for additions, betterments, and improvements, and for other corporate purposes, the Public Utilities Commission of the District of Columbia is given jurisdiction and power to permit and authorize said Washington Gas Light Co. to increase, from time to time, the amount of its capitalization by the authorization and issuance of capital stock, common or preferred, or both, with or without par value, in such amounts and for such considerations—and in respect of stock preferred as to dividends or assets, with or without voting rights, or with limited voting rights, and having such terms, qualifications, conversion privileges, or conditions—as may be approved by the commission. The commission is likewise authorized to permit the said Washington Gas Light Co. to change all of the shares of its capital stock now authorized, issued, and/or outstanding into the same or a different number of shares issued pursuant to the provisions of this act.

All shares of capital stock of Washington Gas Light Co. hereafter issued for which the agreed consideration shall have been paid or delivered to the company and all shares of capital stock of the company heretofore issued, as well as shares into which such shares heretofore issued may be changed, shall be deemed and taken to be fully paid and nonassessable and not subject to further call or assessment, and there shall be no liability to the company or to creditors of the company on the part of any subscriber to or holder of such shares.

Said Washington Gas Light Co. may, subject to the approval of the Public Utilities Commission, amend its charter so as to make any or all of the above changes and/or increase or increases and/or classification or reclassifications, by following the same procedure and complying with the same requirements as are now prescribed in section 639a of subchapter 4 of chapter 18 of the Code of Law for the District of Columbia, as amended to June 7, 1924, in respect of a change of name by a corporation, and thereupon its charter shall be deemed to be so amended without any further or other act or procedure.

Sec. 3. All charters, statutes, acts, and parts of acts, laws, ordinances, and regulations inconsistent with or repugnant to the provisions of this act, but only so far as inconsistent herewith or repugnant hereto, are hereby repealed.

Sec. 4. The right to alter, amend, or repeal this act or any part thereof is hereby expressly reserved in Congress.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

VETERANS' LEGISLATION

Mr. LANKFORD of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for five minutes out of order.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. LANKFORD of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, we are going to be compelled to consider this question sooner or later, and I want to direct attention to it for a moment.

I have just introduced the following bill, and I ask your most careful consideration of it:

Be it enacted, etc., That on and after the passage of this act no pension, bounty, disability, or allowance save and except insurance benefits on which adequate premiums have been paid, and hospitalization under existing law, shall be paid or allowed to any veteran of any war in which the United States has engaged for any disease, disability, or injury not incurred while in the service of the United States or resulting from such service: *Provided, however,* That the provisions of this act shall not apply to a veteran of any war who is permanently and totally disabled either as a result of service or otherwise, and not as a result of his own misconduct, nor to a veteran who has attained the age of 65 years, and whose gross annual income is less than \$3,000, nor to dependents of deceased veterans entitled to benefits under existing law. All acts or parts of acts in conflict with the above act are hereby repealed.

I feel very keenly that this question should be brought before the country for consideration, and I shall make every effort in my power to secure consideration of this measure before the committee and the House.

During the last campaign the most effective appeal of candidates was an appeal to give them a chance to reduce Government expenditures and relieve a distressed people from the crushing burden of taxation. Those who have prepared their income-tax forms for the current period have had the increases brought sharply to their attention. Many militant candidates for office were clamoring for an opportunity to reduce Government expenses by 25 per cent, but I have only heard vague references to this since the election. Economy has been suggested in most every Government department and bureau, even to drastic economy in our harassed and much needed national defense in this time of world unrest, yet no effort has been made to bring before Congress for its determination the most generally discussed economy measure, which is non-service-connected veterans' pensions. The country is entitled to a hearing on this, and I propose to give it to the country if it is in my power to do so.

I have no patience with excuses—we are judged by our failure or success, and not by excuses. I feel, however, like apologizing to my constituents and my country for not offering an amendment to the veterans' bill which would have brought this question to a vote several days ago. In explanation to them, I wish to say that I understood that an amendment similar to this was to be offered to the independent offices' bill. The veterans' program was the last item in this bill; I had no amendment prepared, and the bill was concluded and immediately acted on with no effort made to bring this question up. I accept the censure and criticism personally, acknowledge my default, and offer no defense but this explanation.

My bill saves hospitalization for the non-service-connected veteran in these distressing times. It is wrong in principle; but the hospitals have been provided and the staffs assembled, and untold suffering and distress can be avoided during the emergency by continuing this relief, but it should be repealed as soon as normal times are restored.

My bill also preserves the award to totally and permanently disabled non-service-connected cases and to veterans who have reached 65 years of age. I have seen many of these hopeless, bedridden sufferers, and, right or wrong, I can not consent to take from them this gift of their country in their utter helplessness. I believe the country can and will gladly assume this burden if it knew the cases as Members of Congress do.

My bill does not disturb the relief for injury or disease incurred by veterans in the service, nor would I vote to take a penny from them.

For the non-service-connected cases drawing disability, short of total and permanent, I sincerely believe that to reduce the crushing burden of taxation and assist business, industry, and commerce to their feet will restore them to useful, self-respecting work, which would be infinitely better for them than the pittance doled out to them as pensions—a pittance to the individual, but a staggering sum in the aggregate to their country.

In principle, this thing is wrong. With the millions of men required in modern warfare, no country, however rich and prosperous, can for 60 or 70 years after a war provide hospitalization for every man and woman in it and a pension as well for every infirmity that afflicts mankind in no way even remotely connected with the service. No country can afford to defend itself at such a price.

In a period of 60 years we can easily visualize three or four different groups of veterans of three or four different wars, each numbering many millions of men and women.

Who is going to pay the enormous sums which will be required for this purpose? It will bankrupt any country that attempts it.

The fear of this expensive aftermath may, and no doubt will, seriously affect our foreign relations, and may occasion a policy of timidity and side-stepping when courage and determination are needed.

I hope I shall never see the day when our country will be forced, through fear of the demands of its uninjured defenders, to adopt this policy.

It takes only a slight stretch of the imagination to conceive of a day when we would say to an aggressor nation, we will pay you a billion; two billion dollars to avoid the expense of defending ourselves. God forbid. This thing is wrong; now is the time to stop it, and by this bill I am offering the Congress and the country an opportunity to do so. [Applause.]

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Virginia has expired.

AMENDMENT OF KIDNAPING LAW—DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mrs. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I call up the bill (S. 4694) to amend section 812 of the Code of Law for the District of Columbia.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 812 of the act entitled "An act to establish a Code of Law for the District of Columbia," approved March 3, 1901, as amended (D. C. Code, title 6, sec. 36), is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 812. Whoever shall be guilty of, or of aiding or abetting in, seizing, confining, inveigling, enticing, decoying, kidnaping, abducting, concealing, or carrying away any individual, by any means whatsoever, and holding or detaining, or with the intent to hold or detain, such individual for ransom or reward, shall, upon conviction thereof, be punished by imprisonment for life or for such term as the court in its discretion may determine. This section shall be held to have been violated if either the seizing, confining, inveigling, enticing, decoying, kidnaping, abducting, concealing, carrying away, holding, or detaining occurs in the District of Columbia. If two or more individuals enter into any agreement or conspiracy to do any act or acts which would constitute a violation of the provisions of this section, and one or more of such individuals do any act to effect the object of such agreement or conspiracy, each such individual shall be deemed to have violated the provisions of this section."

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read a third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

TERMS OF PRESIDENT AND VICE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES AND MEMBERS OF CONGRESS

The SPEAKER laid before the House a communication from F. B. Balzar, Governor of the State of Nevada, stating that the legislature of that State had agreed to the amendment of the Constitution of the United States fixing the commencement of the term of President and Vice President and Members of Congress, and fixing the time of the assembling of Congress.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. JOHNSON of Illinois on account of illness.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mr. PARSONS, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled a bill of the House of the following title, which was thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. R. 11461. An act for the relief of C. N. Hildreth, jr.

The SPEAKER announced his signature to enrolled bills of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 188. An act for the relief of Tampico Marine Iron Works;

S. 222. An act authorizing adjustment of the claim of B. F. Hart;

S. 1586. An act for the relief of the estate of Peter Paul Franzel, deceased; and

S. 4339. An act repealing certain provisions of the act of June 21, 1906, as amended, relating to the sale and encumbrance of lands of Kickapoo and affiliated Indians of Oklahoma.

BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. PARSONS, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that that committee did on this day present to the President, for his approval, bills and a joint resolution of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 311. An act to approve Act No. 268 of the session laws of 1931 of the Territory of Hawaii, entitled "An act to authorize and provide for the manufacture, maintenance, distribution, and supply of electric current for light and power within the island of Molokai;"

H. R. 3033. An act for the relief of Ida E. Godfrey and others;

H. R. 5329. An act to amend section 24 of the act approved February 28, 1925, entitled "An act to provide for the creation, organization, administration, and maintenance of a Naval Reserve and a Marine Corps Reserve," as amended by the act of March 2, 1929;

H. R. 6733. An act for estimates necessary for the proper maintenance of the flood-control works at Lowell Creek, Seward, Alaska;

H. R. 7503. An act to repeal the Executive order of November 23, 1909, making the enticing of laborers from the Isthmian Canal Commission or the Panama Railroad a misdemeanor;

H. R. 7506. An act to repeal an ordinance enacted by the Isthmian Canal Commission August 5, 1911, and approved by the Secretary of War August 22, 1911, establishing market regulations for the Canal Zone;

H. R. 7508. An act to provide for the inspection of vessels navigating Canal Zone waters;

H. R. 7514. An act in relation to the Canal Zone postal service;

H. R. 7515. An act to provide for the establishment of a customs service in the Canal Zone, and other matters;

H. R. 7523. An act to amend sections 7, 8, and 9 of the Panama Canal act, as amended;

H. R. 9166. An act for the relief of William E. B. Grant;

H. R. 9385. An act authorizing Roy H. Campbell, Charles H. Brown, G. H. Wilsey, and Dr. H. O. Strosnider, their heirs, legal representatives, and assigns, to construct, main-

tain, and operate a bridge across the Des Moines River at or near St. Francisville, Mo.;

H. R. 13974. An act granting the consent of Congress to Bonner County, State of Idaho, to construct, maintain, and operate a free highway bridge across Pend Oreille Lake at the city of Sandpoint in the State of Idaho;

H. R. 14060. An act to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across the Columbia River at or near The Dalles, Oreg.;

H. R. 14129. An act to extend the time for completing the construction of a bridge across that portion of Lake Michigan lying opposite the entrance to Chicago River, Ill.; and a bridge across the Michigan Canal, otherwise known as the Ogden Slip, in the city of Chicago, Ill.;

H. R. 14200. An act to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across the St. Lawrence River at or near Alexandria Bay, N. Y.; and

H. J. Res. 597. Joint resolution to provide appropriations to carry into effect the act entitled "An act to authorize the distribution of Government-owned cotton to the American National Red Cross and other organizations for relief of distress," approved February 8, 1933.

ADJOURNMENT

Mrs. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 3 o'clock and 55 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until to-morrow, Tuesday, February 14, 1933, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

934. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting deficiency and supplemental estimates of appropriations for the fiscal year 1933 and prior years for certain executive departments amounting to \$604,941.13 (H. Doc. No. 550); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

935. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting deficiency and supplemental estimates of appropriations for the District of Columbia for the fiscal year 1933 and prior years, amounting in all to \$650,990.08, and a draft of proposed provision pertaining to the appropriation "Buildings and grounds, public schools, District of Columbia, 1933" (H. Doc. No. 551); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

936. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting supplemental estimates of appropriations pertaining to the legislative establishment, United States Senate, for the fiscal year 1933, in the sum of \$68,600 (H. Doc. No. 552); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

937. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting estimates of appropriations submitted by the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to pay claims and suits which have been settled by them amounting to \$113,027.61 (H. Doc. No. 553); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII,

Mr. RAYBURN: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. H. R. 14411. A bill to extend the time for the construction of a bridge across the Rio Grande at Boca Chica, Tex.; with amendment (Rept. No. 2012). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. MALONEY: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. H. R. 14460. A bill to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across the Mississippi River at or near Baton Rouge, La.; with amendment (Rept. No. 2013). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. MALONEY: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. H. R. 14480. A bill to extend the times for

commencing and completing the reconstruction of a railroad bridge across the Little River at or near Morris Ferry, Ark.; without amendment (Rept. No. 2014). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. HOCH: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. H. R. 14500. A bill to extend the time for completing the construction of a bridge across the Missouri River at or near Kansas City, Kans.; without amendment (Rept. No. 2015). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. HUDDLESTON: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. H. R. 14602. A bill to revive and reenact the act entitled "An act granting the consent of Congress to the Highway Department of the State of Alabama to construct a bridge across Elk River between Lauderdale and Limestone Counties, Ala.," approved February 16, 1928; without amendment (Rept. No. 2016). Referred to the House Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. LANKFORD of Virginia: A bill (H. R. 14655) restricting relief to veterans; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

By Mr. NORTON: A bill (H. R. 14656) to provide an additional tax on income from personal services in certain cases; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. McDUFFIE: A bill (H. R. 14657) to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a railroad bridge and/or a toll bridge across the water between the mainland at or near Cedar Point and Dauphin Island, Ala.; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HOWARD: A bill (H. R. 14658) to define the exterior boundaries of the Navajo Indian Reservation in New Mexico, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. KENNEDY of Maryland: A bill (H. R. 14659) authorizing the Chesapeake Bay Bridge Co., its successors and assigns, to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the Chesapeake Bay from a point in Baltimore County to a point in Kent County in the State of Maryland; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. McLEOD: A bill (H. R. 14660) to authorize the Reconstruction Finance Corporation to make loans to aid in financing projects for the construction of garbage and refuse disposal plants and sewerage systems or sewage-disposal works; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. BEEDY: Resolution (H. Res. 378) providing for the consideration of S. 417, an act to provide a government for American Samoa; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. CHRISTOPHERSON: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 599) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States; to the Committee on Election of President, Vice President, and Representatives in Congress.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

Memorial of the Council of the City of Minneapolis, memorializing Congress to enact House Joint Resolution 191; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Wyoming, memorializing Congress to take favorable action on Senate bill 36; to the Committee on Roads.

Memorial of the Board of Supervisors of San Francisco, memorializing Congress to set aside and apart February 15 for the national observance of the birthday of Susan B. Anthony; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Memorial of the Legislature of the State of South Carolina, memorializing Congress to enact House Joint Resolution No. 191; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Texas, indorsing the appointment of Hon. W. E. Lea on the United States

Shipping Board; to the Committee on Merchant Marine, Radio, and Fisheries.

Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Wisconsin, memorializing Congress regarding legislation to secure the farmers their cost of production; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Wisconsin, memorializing Congress to enact a law which will aid farmers and home-owners to retain their farms and homes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Wisconsin, memorializing Congress to confine all contracts to be let for work on the Hoover Dam and other Federal construction projects to American firms and corporations; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII,

Mr. YATES introduced a bill (H. R. 14661) granting a pension to Sarah Ann Jarvis, which was referred to the Committee on Pensions.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

10389. By Mr. CROWTHER: Petition of citizens of Montgomery and Schenectady Counties, N. Y., opposing legalization of alcoholic liquors stronger than one-half of 1 per cent; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

10390. By Mr. GARBER: Petition of citizens of Alva, Okla., urging enactment of the stop-alien-representation amendment to the Constitution; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

10391. Also, petition of Roy Hoffman Camp, No. 8, United Spanish War Veterans, Chandler, Okla., protesting against attitude toward veterans' relief and activities of the United States Chamber of Commerce, the National Economy League, and certain individuals to further limit benefits provided by law; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

10392. Also, petition of Los Angeles Chamber of Commerce, urging protective legislation against importations from foreign countries with depreciated currencies; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

10393. By Mr. HOOPER: Petition of members of Women's Missionary Society, of Battle Creek, Mich., favoring the enactment of a law to regulate the motion-picture industry and support of Senate bill 1079 and Senate Resolution 170; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

10394. By Mr. KVALE: Petition of the Young Women's Christian Association Council, Minneapolis, Minn., urging enactment of Senate Resolution 170 and Senate bill 1079; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

10395. Also, petition of Woman's Club, Litchfield, Minn., urging enactment of Senate Resolution 170 and Senate bill 1079; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

10396. By Mr. LAMNECK: Petition of the Frances Willard Branch, Franklin Woman's Christian Temperance Union, of Columbus, Ohio, petitioning Congress to establish a Federal motion-picture commission for the regulation of the motion-picture industry, and the passage of Senate bill 1079 and Senate Resolution 170; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

10397. By Mr. LEWIS: Resolution of the Chamber of Commerce of Bethesda, Md., opposing any reduction in salary reductions to Federal employees; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

10398. Also, resolutions of the Chamber of Commerce, Bethesda, Md., favoring a sales tax as a means of balancing the Budget; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

10399. By Mr. LINDSAY: Petition of W. A. Simpson, president, Los Angeles (Calif.) Chamber of Commerce, favoring prompt legislation to correct inequalities caused by depreciated currencies; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

10400. By Mr. PARKER of Georgia: Memorial of the citizens of Montgomery County, Ga., in mass meeting assembled,

submitted by John Underwood, secretary, protesting against the repeal of the eighteenth amendment to the Constitution of the United States of America; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

10401. Also, resolution adopted by the Kiwanis Club of Columbus, Ga., expressing disapproval of the acts of those Members of Congress who voted against increasing the Budget estimates for the Military Establishment of the United States in appropriations carried in the War Department appropriation bill for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1934; to the Committee on Appropriations.

10402. Also, petition of Hon. H. M. Blount and 31 other prominent citizens of Waynesboro, Burke County, Ga., urging an immediate investigation of the functioning of the Macon, Ga., branch of the Regional Agricultural Credit Corporation; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

10403. By Mr. PERSON: Petition of Ada L. Griswold and 25 other residents of Walled Lake, Mich., favoring the stop-alien-representation amendment to the Constitution; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

10404. Also, petition of Bertha A. Lewis and 12 others, of Hazel Park, Mich., favoring the Steiwer and Rankin bills; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

10405. Also, petition of the City Commission of the City of Pontiac, Mich., favoring House bill 14125; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

10406. By Mr. RUDD: Petition of Los Angeles Chamber of Commerce, urging legislation to correct inequalities caused by depreciated foreign currency; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

10407. By Mr. SEGER: Petition of Chamber of Commerce of Paterson, N. J., favoring emergency legislation to protect American industries from exports of foreign countries of depreciated currencies; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

10408. By Mr. SWANK: Resolution by the Senate of the State of Oklahoma, memorializing the Congress of the United States to enact a law reducing first-class postage to 2-cent base rate; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

10409. By Mr. WELCH: Petition of the Board of Supervisors of the City and County of San Francisco, adopted on February 6, 1933, Resolution No. 625, urging that Congress set aside and apart February 15 for national observance of the birthday of Susan B. Anthony; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

10410. By Mr. YATES: Petition of John W. Bell, Alice C. McKemgh, Arthur R. Petrie, and other citizens of Chicago, Ill., urging support of the Dieterich bill, H. R. 14265; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

10411. By the SPEAKER: Petition of Eduarda K. Baltuff (Harriss), urging an investigation of the smuggling of foreigners into this country; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SENATE

TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 14, 1933

(Legislative day of Friday, February 10, 1933)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senate will receive a message from the House of Representatives.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives by Mr. Chaffee, one of its clerks, announced that the House had passed without amendment the following bills and joint resolution of the Senate:

S. 4673. An act to amend an act entitled "An act to incorporate the trustees of the Female Orphan Asylum in Georgetown, and the Washington City Orphan Asylum in the District of Columbia," approved May 24, 1828, as amended by act of June 23, 1874;

S. 4694. An act to amend section 812 of the Code of Law for the District of Columbia;